

AN
ANSWER
TO THE
PRINTED SPEECH
OF

EDMUND BURKE, Esq;

SPOKEN IN THE

House of Commons, *April 19, 1774.*

IN WHICH

His Knowledge in Polity, Legislature, Humankind,
History, Commerce and Finance, is candidly examined;
his Arguments are fairly refuted; the Conduct of Ad-
ministration is fully defended; and his Oratoric Talents
are clearly exposed to view.

ADDRESSED TO THE PEOPLE.

Est etiam in quibusdam turba inanum verborum, qui dum
communem loquendi morem reformidant, ducti specie
nitentia, circumeunt omnia copiosa loquacitate quæ dicere
volunt.

QUINTILIAN, l. 8. ch. 2.

..... nec lex est æquior ulla
Quam necis artifices arte perire sua.

OVID.

For rhetoric he cou'd not ope
His mouth, but out there flew a trope,
This he as volubly wou'd vent
As if his stock would ne'er be spent;
And truly to support that charge,
He had supplies as vast and large;
For he cou'd coin, or counterfeit
New words with little or no wit.

HUDIBRAS.

L O N D O N :

Printed for T. EVANS, near *York-Buildings*, in the *Strand*;
and J. BEW, No. 28, in *Pater-noster Row*. M.DCC.LXXV.

[Price Three Shillings and Sixpence.]

P R E F A C E.

HAD the speech of Mr. Burke been shorter, or less open to refutation, this answer would have been shorter also. But when every page is replete with such things as were too singular to be unobserved; when a selecting of particular passages would have borne the face of a partial and disingenuous enquiry, it was thought more eligible to be just than concise, and to refute the whole; since the whole was refutable. Had either his knowledge of the subjects, on which he spoke, the arguments which he adduced, or the powers of oratory, which he is thought to possess, been unexamined, the part omitted would have been pronounced, by his hardy associates, to be unanswerable. On that account, the examination has been carried thro' the whole; and the length of it must be ascribed to Mr. Burke. Besides this, as it contains,

tains, not only an answer to this speech, but to all that has been offered by the patriots on that subject, it may be of use to both sides of the question; and as it includes the history also of all that important transaction, it may not unlikely be of service to remove the prejudices of the deluded; and to establish the sentiments of the well-disposed. Of this I am convinced. It will prove that his majesty and his ministry are engaged in defending the dignity of the realm, and the rights of the people, and be "*a full refutation of the charges of that party with which Mr. Burke has all along acted.*" The editor of this answer, hath not kept it back, from a *delicacy possibly over scrupulous*: but the publication hath been retarded, more than a month, by a fit of the gout, that was not *over scrupulously delicate*.

A N
A N S W E R

To the S P E E C H of

Edmund Burke, Esq;

IT has been a long, an universal, and a just complaint, that the senate-house, in which your Representatives assemble, is not only too small to contain the whole number of the members; but that you, the community of this kingdom, are thereby precluded from being present on those occasions that are the most interesting to your welfare. Not the smallness of your house alone, the perverseness of your servants also, augments the impracticability of your being truly informed of what is therein transacted. Nothing is authentically

B

given

given to the public. Even the admission of one man, who might commit their inimitable harangues to paper, is prohibited. In consequence of these circumstances, all the means, of obtaining a genuine information of what each senator delivers, are absolutely rescinded. Ignorance, presumption, party-spirit, envy and self-interest, either separately or in conjunction, preposterously exalt, or scandalously depreciate the performances of your speakers, according to the dispositions and views of those who report them : so that their intrinsic merit is seldom to be known. On this account, it is justly your ardent wish that the patriots would publish their speeches under their own inspection; and prevent the barbarism of the London Evening Post, and other papers, from mutilating that precious offspring which hath cost them so much care and study to bring into the world; and which you are not permitted to see but in detached parts and dissevered limbs.

Mr. Burke, touched with paternal tenderness for your welfare, and conscious that it is the duty of every upright member to comply with your desires, unactuated by vanity or malevolence, hath graciously led the way to the demolition of that unconstitutional practice : and hath given you in print that celebrated Oration which he delivered on the 19th of last April, with so much applause, from his own patriotic party. It appears from the Preface to this oration, “ that it was much the subject of
“ conversation, and that the desire of having it print-
“ ed *last summer* was very general ;” and therefore you were presented with it *this winter*. You are informed also, “ that the means of gratifying the
“ public curiosity were obligingly furnished from the
“ notes of some gentlemen, members of the last
par-

“parliament ; that it has been many months ready
 “for the press ; but that a delicacy, possibly over-
 “scrupulous, has delayed the publication to this
 “time.”

It is extremely natural for men of *a delicacy so over scrupulous*, and so free from vanity, as Mr. Burke will appear to be in the examination of this Speech, to apologize for such things ; as others of more confident dispositions give to the world, without the least diffidence or hesitation.

Notwithstanding what has been just said, respecting the *means* furnished from the notes of other gentlemen ; this Speech is not to be considered to be in print, as it fell from the lips of the Orator in the house of commons. But as having received the utmost finishing and perfection which he can give to his rhetorical performances. It is manifestly on a subject not unpremeditated. It is the full result of *nine years* study. It may therefore be justly deemed to include a complete exhibition of those oratoric excellences which he so eminently possesses : and from hence his merits may be accurately known, and truly ascertained. Rash as the undertaking may be deemed. Unterrified by the fate which fell on *Æschines*, when he arraigned *Demosthenes*, the most celebrated of the Grecian orators, “it is a speech so
 “chequered and speckled ; a piece of joinery so
 “crossly indented and whimsically dove-tailed ; a
 “cabinet so variously inlaid ; such a piece of diver-
 “sified Mosaic ; such a tessellated pavement without
 “cement :”* *I’ll cross it though it blast me.*

B 2

This

* It is an admonition of Longinus, that whoever would write on any subject should previously consider, in what manner the most eminent authors have delivered themselves on similar

This Speech was delivered in answer to what had been spoken by Mr. Cornwall, on *a motion to take into consideration, the duty of Three-pence per pound weight upon Tea, payable in all his majesty's American dominions.* On this question; and in this harangue, the Orator has taken occasion to introduce a pompous panegyric on his Master and himself; and to reprehend, with his natural *over-scrupulousness of delicacy*, the conduct of all other ministers. "He tells you, it contains a full refutation of the charges against that party with which Mr. Burke has all along acted; the subject is interesting; the matters of information various and important." It therefore claims your strictest attention.

He begins, "I agree with the honourable gentleman, who spoke last, that this subject is not
"new

similar occasions, and emulate their manner of thinking and expression. I have observed that rule. I have selected Mr. Burke, and more than imitated him, in the passage to which this note refers. There are, indeed, both a similarity and dissimilarity, between Longinus and Mr. Burke, extremely remarkable. Both of them have written on the sublime. The Grecian practised the preceding rule, *and was himself the great sublime he drew.* The Hybernian practises that rule also. So far they resemble. But then he follows the examples of writers who are of another stamp. In forming this Oration the ΠΕΡΙ ΒΑΘΟΥΣ of Martinus Scriblerus was continually before his eyes, as it shall be shewn in a number of notes in this answer. Longinus was secretary to Zenobia, queen of the Palmyrians. Mr. Burke to a First Lord of the Treasury. Longinus prevailed on his mistress not to yield to the demands of the emperor Aurelian; but to defend her dominions to the last extremity. Mr. Burke persuaded his master to flee from before the face of rebels, and to grant their lawless demands without contention. Longinus was famously put to death for this virtuous and heroic conduct. Mr. Burke is still alive, and justifying that transaction, which so signally disgraced his master and injured this country. Such is their dissimilitude.

" new to this house, very disagreeable to this house,
 " very unfortunately to this nation, and to the peace
 " and prosperity of this whole empire; no topic has
 " been more familiar to us, for *nine long years*;
 " session after session, we have been lashed round and
 " round this miserable circle of occasional arguments
 " and temporary expedients. I am sure our heads
 " must turn and our stomachs nauseate with them.
 " We have had them in every shape; we have look-
 " ed at them in every point of view; invention is
 " exhausted; reason is fatigued; experience has giv-
 " en judgement; but obstinacy is not yet con-
 " quered."

From this passage, it is evident that his speech
 includes, not only the fruits of *nine years voluntary*
labour, but all that could be *whipped* out of him
 by a *nine years lashing* also. Within six lines he
 plunges into metaphor; conjoins those *arguments*
 and *expedients* which never can be brought to touch;
 and bends the *inflexible progression* of time and oc-
casion into a circle,* round which the commons,
 like asses working in a mill, are miserably lashed
 for nine long years. No wonder then their heads
 grow giddy, and their stomachs nauseate those
 arguments and expedients. And altho' he tells you
 they have been *constantly* lashed in this *one* miserable
circle, "they have nevertheless had them in *every*
shape," square, triangle, isosceles, polygon, and

B 3

scalenum;

* And I will venture to lay it down as the first maxim and
 corner stone of this our art, that whoever would excel there-
 in, must studiously avoid, detest, and turn his head from all
 the ideas, ways, and workings of that pestilent foe to wit,
 and *destroyer of fine figures*, which is known by the name of *com-*
mon sense: his business must be to contract the true *gout de*
travers, and to acquire a most happy, uncommon, unac-
 countable way of thinking.

.. Bathos. C. 5th. of the true genius for the profound.

scalenum. And although invention be exhausted; reason fatigued; experience hath given judgment; and the subject hath turned the heads and stomachs of the members; all which are reasons for *his* observation of insuperable silence; he nevertheless begins a *new lashing* by a speech of two hours duration, and demonstrates that *his* obstinacy is not yet conquered. Such is the wonderful consistency with which this incomparable speaker begins and ends his matchless exordium.

However, he tells you, "the honourable gentleman has made one endeavour more to diversify the form of this disgusting *argument*." What argument? he has mentioned none. But he explains himself, "he has thrown out a speech composed almost entirely of challenges. Challenges are serious things: and as he is a man of prudence as well as resolution, he dares to say Mr. Cornwall has very well weighed those challenges before he delivered them." This and "the submission of his *poor* opinions to the house," are undoubtedly intended to be ironically received. For had his opinion of Mr. Cornwall been so *great*, and of himself so *poor*, would it not have been an unpardonable temerity to have undertaken to answer those challenges which the former had thrown out? especially when it will be shewn how prudent it had been, had he never accepted them.

Mr. Cornwall "has stated to the house," as the orator informs you, "two grounds of deliberation, one narrow and simple, and merely confined to the question on the paper; the other more large and more complicated, comprehending the whole series of the parliamentary proceedings, with regard to America, their causes, and their consequences." It is acknowledged by the ancients, who

who have written best on the subject of oratory, that figures justly formed and happily introduced give an elevation to a speech that cannot be attained by any other rhetorical powers. This idea hath not been concealed from this speaker. And as he constantly adheres to *Mortyn*, as his archetype of excellence, what office can be more agreeable to him than that of evincing how perfectly he is master of his favourite author. Hence it is he chooses to *state the grounds*. To *state a question*, a *proposition*, or a *case*; and to *lay out grounds* would be a deviation into common sense and good English, which is contrary to the doctrine of the celebrated Scriblerus, who says he cannot too earnestly recommend his authors the study of the *abuse of speech*.* A ground may be also *narrow*, it may be *rough* or *smooth*, *steep* or *plain*, but a *simple* ground is new. And does it not seem difficult to conceive how the larger ground which *comprehends* the whole *series* of parliamentary proceedings, their causes, and consequences, the most *regular* and *uniform* of all successions, can be a *complicated ground*? and since the larger ground does comprehend this *whole* series with regard to America, what occasion could there be to state *two* grounds, a less and a bigger, when the whole is included in the last? I suspect this happy thought was taken from the person who, having a large and a little cat, cut two holes in his door of different sizes, because he did not conceive that the *little cat* could go through the *large* hole.† “With regard to the latter ground, Mr.

B 4

“Cornwal

* Bathos. Ch. 10. of tropes and figures, in the catachresis, *mow the beard, shave the grass, pin the plank, nail my sleeve.*

† Bathos, c. 9. of imitation. Imitation is of two sorts; 1st, when force to our own purposes the thoughts of others. The 2d consists in copying imperfections and blemishes.

“Cornwal, he says, *states* it as useless, and thinks it
 “may be even dangerous to enter into so extensive
 “a field of enquiry. Yet to his surprize he had hardly
 “laid down this restrictive proposition, to which his
 “authority would have given so much weight, when
 “directly and with the same authority he condemns
 “it, and declares it absolutely necessary to enter into
 “the most ample historical detail. His zeal has
 “thrown him out of his usual accuracy. He has re-
 “probated in one part of his speech, the rule he had
 “laid down for debate in the other, and after nar-
 “rowing the ground for all those who are to speak
 “after him, he takes an excursion himself, as un-
 “bounded as the subject and the extent of his great
 “abilities.”

There is nothing which more essentially exposes
 a speaker to ridicule than a pleasantry on others,
 founded on a want of comprehension in himself.
 Such is the present case. He hath described Mr.
 Cornwall as contradicting himself in stating an en-
 quiry into the larger ground, as dangerous: and
 then, in declaring it absolutely necessary to enter
 into the most ample historical detail; and in re-
 probating the rule in one part, which he had laid
 down in another. On what is this assertion found-
 ed? Mr. Cornwall asserts, “that retrospect is not
 “wise; and the proper, the only proper subject of
 “enquiry is, *not how they got into this difficulty, but*
 “*how they are to get out of it.*”

Such are the words, on which he has founded
 his charge of Mr. Cornwall's want of accuracy.
 Do *these* words, which limit the subject to the *future*
 means of extrication *only*, declare the necessity of
returning to an *historical* detail of what *was* *past*?
 do these enlarge the ground “to the comprehen-
 sion

sion of the whole series of parliamentary proceedings, with regard to America, their causes and consequences," which absolutely interdict all retrospect, and urge the attention of the house to *subsequent* considerations only? "*has not his zeal thrown him more than a little into his usual inaccuracy?*" Not content with this exhibition of his misconception, he presumes to give an explanatory sense to those words of Mr. Cornwall, which no comment can render more plain. And then, by the natural obliquity of his understanding, he succeeds as happily in this attempt as in the preceding. "In other words, says he, we are, according to Mr. Cornwall, to consult our invention, and to reject our experience." These, indeed, are not only *other words*, but they convey *other ideas* than an intellect merely human can derive from those of Mr. Cornwall. They neither direct you to *consult invention*, nor to *reject experience*. On the contrary, in saying, the only proper enquiry is, *how to get out of that difficulty*, do they exclude experience, reason, common sense; and tell you to consult *invention* only? I will undertake, with the chemist in the flying island, to extract sun-beams out of cucumbers, and succeed in it too, whenever Mr. Burke's signification shall be extracted from Mr. Cornwall's words. In his explanation, however, this reprehensive orator hath manifestly excluded not only reason, common sense, and experience, but shown the impotence of his invention also.

In proportion as he errs in judgment, he improves in peremptoriness. "This mode of deliberation, which Mr. Cornwall recommends, he asserts; is diametrically opposite to every rule of reason, and every principle of good sense establish-
ed

“ed among mankind. For that sense, and that reason, *he* hath *always* understood, absolutely to prescribe, whenever we are involved in difficulties, from the measures we have pursued, that we should take a strict review of those measures, in order to correct our errors, if they should be corrigible.”

It is requisite that I once more bring before you the words of Mr. Cornwall. “*The proper, the only proper enquiry is, not how we got into this difficulty, but how we are to get out of it.*” Do these words, which state the object of the enquiry, to be, *how to get out of the difficulty*, recommend or convey the least idea of the *MODE* of deliberation? Hence it is evident, he mistakes the *fashion* for the substance of which it is *formed*. Is it not necessary that a man should understand the words he utters before he presume to be an orator? but to experience I appeal, the judge which he asserts Mr. Cornwall hath rejected, whether it “be so diametrically opposite to every rule of *reason* and every principle of *good sense* established among mankind.”

If any man, by carelessly sleeping, and leaving his candle unextinguished, should set his bed on fire, and waking, find himself surrounded with the flame, do *reason* and *good sense* absolutely prescribe, that he should take a strict review of the measures by which he was involved in that difficulty, before he attempts to get out of it? If the house should take fire, and the engines be ready to extinguish it, is it opposite to every rule of *reason*, and every principle of *good sense*, to suffer the engines to play before the proprietor hath taken a strict review of the measures which involved him in that difficulty? if a mariner, by an
er-

erroneous reckoning, find himself, at day-break, on a lee-shore, and that his vessel hath sprung a leak, do *reason* and *good sense* absolutely prescribe that, before he attempts to get off that shore, and to stop the leak, he should take a strict review of the measures that brought him into those difficulties? In these cases, and innumerable others, would not such a mode of deliberation be opposite to every *rule of reason*, and every *principle of good sense*, established among mankind?

But although the experience of mankind, and the very exposure of this opinion, do manifest its absurdity; I am nevertheless convinced, that this Orator has constantly understood, that it is right. Because, through his whole speech, he undeviatingly sees all objects in an inverted order. And, from this instance, is it not a fair inference, that his *reason* and *good sense* are in contrast with those of all other men: and that he is the only person who possesses both in perfection? but he is too delicate to deliver that opinion. You shall see it, however, in his practice. For were his opinion to be adopted, every fire must be a general conflagration of that place in which it happens. Plagues must spread through kingdoms, because every *rule of reason*, every *principle of good sense* interdicts the means of stopping their progress, until the measures be strictly reviewed, by which they were brought into them. And thus, according to his wisdom, the world would speedily be involved in difficulties irremediable. These are indisputably invincible reasons for coinciding with his opinion, and for rejecting that of Mr. Cornwall. They prove also, how admirably his intellect is adapted to *guide* a minister who is to *guide* the
state;

state, or to execute that object of his ambition, the sole guidance of it, by his own faculties. For who can be more adequately selected for so important a duty than a man who, on *principle*, would permit the enemy to land without opposition, until he had taken a strict review of those measures by which the nation was involved in that difficulty?

Such being the result of his understanding, in the preceding instance, he adds, " he will freely follow Mr. Cornwall in his historical discussion, without the least management for men or measures, farther than they shall seem to him to deserve it." I will follow *his* example, respecting himself, and all others. I will observe him as a supervisor does an exciseman; examine his accounts; expose his errors to your inspection, and omit nothing which can give you satisfaction." Only that I will not tread "the narrow ground," but the *narrow path*; because I will not follow him in the *exquisiteness* of his tropes.

Mr. Cornwall, as the Orator affirms, "desires to know, whether, if the house were to repeal this tax, agreeably to the proposition of the motion, the Americans would not take post on this condition, in order to make a new attack on the next body of taxes; and whether they would not call for a repeal of the duty on wines, as loudly as they do now for the duty on Teas?" And thus, according to the ideas of this speaker, a question on what may be the events of *futurity*, is an *historical* discussion of what is *past*; which, unless a man may write the *history* of things that *never* have happened, as well as speak on subjects which he never understood seems to be incomprehensible. Did Mr. Cornwall express himself in a manner so incongruous? did he convert a *concession* into a plain of *terra firma*, and

and post the Americans thereon, in line of battle, to attack the next *body of taxes*, which, by *prosopopœia*, are converted into an *army*, to be assailed by those Americans? It is so truly *Burkean* in the conception and the stile, that I cannot, in conscience, pilfer him of the merit of that beautiful act of imagination, although his modesty ascribes it to Mr. Cornwall. For such is the characteristic excellence of this speaker, that his *words fly from his lips* like race-horses; whilst his *ideas stand stock-still* in his *brain*, like spectators at the starting-post.

Mr. Cornwall asks a plain question; "what would be the event of repealing the Tea duty?" Mr. Burke, in answer, replies, "he can give no security on that subject." He was asked his opinion on what might happen in America? he answers, as if he were required to give an obligation to pay a debt in England. "He can give no security." He is asked one question, and returns an answer which belongs to another. However, "he will do all he can, and all that can be fairly demanded. To the *experience* which Mr. Cornwall reprobates, in one instance, and reverts to in the next, to that *experience*, without the least wavering or hesitation, on his part, he steadily appeals." You have already seen his success in appealing to experience, in the antecedent instance. You will soon perceive a like effect in this also; and find that it has given judgment against him. For it now appears, that the *experience*, which Mr. Cornwall *rejected for invention*, was nevertheless *not rejected*, but *reprobated*, for one instant, and *reverted to* in the next. But it is the singular fate of this speaker, to be uniformly in one series of self-contradiction. However, this is his answer. "When parliament repealed the Stamp-act, in the year, 1766, he affirms, first, " that

“ that the Americans did *not*, in consequence of this
 “ measure, call upon them to give up the former
 “ parliamentary revenue, which subsisted in that
 “ country.” That they did not, at that time, call
 upon parliament, in order to obtain a surrender of
 the former revenues, is true ; and the reasons
 which withheld them shall be shewn, when I come
 to lay the Rockingham administration before you.
 It is to be remarked also, that this appeal is not
 to *experience*, but to the Orator *himself* ; and how
 well he is instructed by *experience* has been already
 evinced.

He continues his appeal to the same experience,
 and “ affirms also, that when departing from the
 “ maxims of the repeal, the Commons revived the
 “ scheme of taxation, and thereby filled the minds
 “ of the colonists with fresh jealousy, and all sorts of
 “ apprehensions, then it was they quarrelled with
 “ the old taxes as well as the new ; then it was, and
 “ not till then, that they questioned all the parts of
 “ your legislative power, and by the *battery* of such
 “ *questions*, have shaken the solid structure of this
 “ empire to its deepest foundations.”

That this strenuous affirmation of Mr. Burke
 is not the result of experience, I shall prove from
 that which experience dictated to an indisputable
 judge, the governor of the province of Massa-
 chusetts. In his letter dated Feb. 28, 1776, he
 says “ the *stamp* act is become, in *itself*, a *matter* of
 “ *indifference* : it is swallowed up in the importance
 “ of the effects of what it has been the cause, the
 “ taxing of the *Americans* by parliament has brought
 “ their very subjection to the crown of *Great Britain*
 “ in question. To reconcile this, and to ascertain
 “ the nature of the subjection of the colonies to the
 “ crown of *Great-Britain*, will be a work of time
 and

“ and difficulty, even though the stamp-act should
 “ be removed to pave the way; the people
 “ have felt their strength, and flatter themselves
 “ that it is much greater than it is, and will not
 “ submit readily to any thing they do not like.”

Such was his opinion before the repeal of that act; you shall see how it was confirmed by that which followed it, in his letter of January the 28th, 1768; he tells you, “ I understand that it
 “ is a prevailing opinion, on your side the ocean,
 “ that America, if left alone, will come to herself,
 “ and return to the same sense of duty and obedience to *Great-Britain*, which she possessed before
 “ the stamp-act. But when the dispute has been
 “ carried so far as to involve in it matters of the
 “ highest importance to the *imperial sovereignty*;
 “ when it has produced questions which the *sovereign*
 “ state cannot give up, and the *dependent* states insist
 “ upon as terms of reconciliation; when the *im-*
 “ *perial* state has so far given way as to let the *de-*
 “ *pendent* states flatter themselves, that their pre-
 “ tensions are admissible; whatever terms of recon-
 “ ciliation time, accident, or design may produce,
 “ if they are deficient in settling the true relation of
 “ *Great-Britain* to her *colonies*, and ascertaining the
 “ bounds of the *sovereignty* of one, and the *de-*
 “ *pendence* of the other, conciliation will be no more
 “ than suspension of hostilities. It was easy to be
 “ foreseen that the distinctions used in parliament,
 “ in favour of the Americans, would be adopted by
 “ them, and received as fundamental laws.

“ Let us state the positions urged in parliament
 “ on the behalf of the Americans. It was said in
 “ parliament, that 1st, the parliament have no right
 “ to tax the Americans, because the Americans have
 “ no representatives in parliament. 2d, But they
 “ have

“ have a right to impose *port duties*, or *external*
 “ taxes, because such duties are for the regulation
 “ of trade. 3d, The difference between an *external*
 “ and *internal* tax is, that the former is imposed for
 “ the regulation of trade, and the latter for raising a
 “ revenue. From these premises, the Americans
 “ have drawn the following conclusions, 1. *port*
 “ *duties* imposed for raising a revenue are *internal*
 “ taxes. 2. *Port duties*, of which the produce is
 “ to be paid into the exchequer for the use of go-
 “ vernment, are imposed for raising a revenue.
 “ 3. The produce of all the *port duties*, imposed
 “ on America is ordered to be paid into the ex-
 “ chequer for the use of government. 4. All the
 “ *port duties* imposed on America are *internal* taxes.
 “ The only difference between the *port duties*, de-
 “ clared to be for raising a revenue, and those of
 “ which no such declaration is made, is, that in one,
 “ the intention is explicit: in the other, it is im-
 “ plied. They both come within the definition of
 “ internal taxes; and there are no taxes left for the
 “ distinction to operate upon. This is not a ficti-
 “ tious argument but a real one, now urged and in-
 “ sisted upon as the terms of a good agreement be-
 “ tween *Great-Britain* and her colonies.”

Such is the experience to which I appeal. Such
 is the evidence which confronts this orator. An
 evidence which from his speech confessedly ap-
 pears to have been seen by him; and acknowledged
 to be authentic. An evidence that proves that
 the Americans quarrelled with the *old* taxes
 as well as the *new*, not only after but before the
 stamp-act was repealed: and that these quarrels
 were not only produced by the debates in par-
 liament before it was enacted; but that they were
 increased by the repeal of that act *which flattered*
them

them that their pretensions were admissible. This evidence, to which he offers no disproof, he hardily contradicts ; and confidently affirms “ that not till after the revival of the last taxation, that then it was, and not till then they questioned all the parts of your legislative power.” Such is the issue of his appeal to experience ; it gives the lie direct to all he has affirmed. Whether you conclude therefore that vanity hath turned his head ; desperation hath urged him to this affirmation ; or want of intellect hath rendered him incapable to comprehend the meaning of the preceding letters from that governor, who, was witness to these American actions, will you longer listen to him who thus affirms what facts disprove ; and be deluded by such assertions as carry with them their own refutation ? but you have already seen and will see, in a multiplicity of instances, that it is the distinguishing characteristic of this speaker, to *affirm* without *proof* ; *revile* without *cause* ; *defend* without *argument* ; and *conclude* without *reason*.

But amidst the croud of his affirmations, he shall not charge me with inobservance on the excellence of his *figures*. “ It was by the *battery of such questions* of your legislative power, the Americans have shaken the solid structure of this empire to its deepest foundations.” A battery of *charges*, a battery of *assertions*, a battery of *accusations*, may be a supportable metaphor : but a *battery of questions* is absolutely irreconcilable with every idea of attacks by artillery. And yet “ the solid structure of this empire was shaken from its foundations by a *battery of American questions*.” Why will the pertinaciousness of the ministry persevere in supporting the dignity of this empire, when it is evident, from this orator, it is now fundamentally :
C

damentally shaken? and will it not be totally subverted by a second discharge of that tremendous battery of *questions*? On this occasion, and in conformity with truth, I must candidly declare, that it was a manifest injustice to this incomparable speaker, to say his *invention* was exhausted: Is it not undeniable, that *he* clearly stands the inventor of this new and formidable improvement in artillery?

He persists, respecting the conduct of the Americans, after the repeal of the stamp act; and christening his *affirmations* by the appellation of *propositions*, he says, “of those two propositions, I shall before I have done give such damning proof, that however the contrary may be whispered in circles, or bawled in news papers, they never more will dare to raise their voices in this house.”* Here again you see a fresh instance of his inventive faculties. He has imagined the *propositions* to be two persons; the first to *whisper* in *circles*, and the second to *bawl* in *news papers*, and then assures you “they never more will dare to *raise their voices* in your *house*.” And thus he makes them members of parliament also: or the whole passage is one piece of ungrammatical stuff, commonly called nonsense. As to his second proposition, “that the minds of the colonists were not filled with jealousy and apprehensions, that they quarrelled not with the old taxes, nor questioned all the parts of the legislative power, until the scheme of the new taxation was arrived;” I have already given him such proof as hath already damned his affirmation. It shall be confirmed in the subsequent parts of this answer, and

* Bathos, chap. 10. in metonymy, the inversion of causes for effects.

and the first shall inevitably follow the same road, and both be damned together.

"I speak," says he, with great confidence." His confidence is great indeed. Yet had not his *overscrupulous delicacy* withheld him, his speaking might have justly borne a more expressive epithet. He adds also, "he has reason for it." A truth indisputable, since by the assistance of *that* alone he can entertain the least hope to be freed from the embarrassments of his damning proofs.

Mark how vigorously he advances, sustained by his powerful ally. "The ministers are with me, "they at least are convinced that the repeal of the "stamp act, had not, and that no repeal can have "the consequences which Mr. Cornwall, who defends their measures is so much alarmed at. To "their conduct I refer him for a conclusive answer "to his objection. He carries his proof irresistibly "into the very body of both ministry and parliament, "not on any general reasoning, growing out of collateral matter, but on the conduct of Mr. Cornwall's ministerial friends on the new revenue itself."

This indeed is speaking with great confidence. Proofs which have hitherto been carried into the *minds*, are by him carried irresistibly into the very *bodies* of the ministers and parliament. At first I imagined this image had been taken from the prowess of Sir John Falstaffe, who *bore his point* so irresistibly into the bodies of seven buckram men; out of eleven of his own creation, whom he never touched: for there is a wonderful affinity to be seen between that sword of the knight, and the proofs of the orator. They enter nothing and are equally irresistible. In both instances, all is buckram of their own invention. But on a second consideration, it incontrovertibly appears, that this image of

carrying his *proofs* irresistibly into the *bodies* of ministers and parliament men, is taken from the mode, which he has represented to have been so *irresistible* in Mr. Charles Townshend, and which will be shewn in this answer.

He proceeds to delineate the conduct of the ministry, and on that conduct to carry his irresistible proofs into their bodies. "The act of 1767, which grants this tea duty, sets forth in its preamble, that it was expedient to raise a revenue in America, for the support of the civil government there, as well as for purposes still more extensive. To this support the act assigns six branches of duties. About two years after this act passed, the ministry, I mean the present ministry, thought it expedient to repeal five of the duties, and to leave (for reasons best known to themselves) only the sixth standing. Suppose any person, at the time of that repeal, had thus addressed lord North. Condemning, as you do, the repeal of the stamp act, why do you venture to repeal the duties upon paper, glass, and painter's colours? let your pretence for the repeal be what it will, are you not thoroughly convinced, that your concessions will produce, not satisfaction, but insolence in the Americans; and that the giving up these taxes will necessitate the giving up of all the rest. This objection was as palpable then as it is now; and it was as good for preserving the five duties as for retaining the sixth. Upon the principles therefore of Mr. Cornwall, upon the principles of the minister himself, the minister has nothing to answer." Greatly confident as this assertion must appear in him, I am equally confident that the minister had not only an answer, but a perfect refutation of what that breaker so peremptorily asserts. The answer is so obvious, that even I shall presume to give it. An

answer which would be altogether needless, had this gentleman been acquainted with those *reasons* for their conduct, which he says "*are best known to themselves,*" and without the knowledge of which, nothing but the greatest confidence could have prompted him to *suppose* an *address*, and to *expect* an *answer*. But it is the eternal consequence of *ignorance* united with *vanity*, that the former, seeing but little, is prompted, by the latter to conceive, not only, that it sees the whole; but that no others see so much as he in whom they are conjoined.

That no evasion, no prevarication, no misrepresentation of the particulars contained in the preceding *address*, may be charged on me, I will examine every part of it; and give the whole a candid answer. The repeal of the stamp act was condemned because it was yielded to the demands of Americans in rebellion; and because it tacitly allowed the parliament had no right to tax them. It sacrificed the dignity of the legislature, and of the executive power intrusted to those who were ministers when that repeal was passed. By the repeal of the duties on glass, paper, and colours, still leaving that on tea existing, the purposes of supporting the sovereign authority were kept as *executive* as if the other duties had not been repealed. There was no risk, no danger, in the repeal; and therefore nothing was ventured by the ministry, which they had the least reason *not* to venture.

The pretence, as this gentleman styles it, was, that it was done "*on the true principles of commerce,*" which shall be unanswerably proved when I come to examine the letter of lord Hillsborough. The ministry were perfectly convinced that nothing short of conceding not only all the taxes, but renouncing the supreme power of the realm would

satisfy those rebels. They estimated their increase of *insolence* not at a pin's value. They derided the *necessity*, which he represents they would be under, of *giving up* all the rest. And they prepared to subdue their insolence, by means of that executive power which the minister of this speaker so timidly relinquished to traitors, and *they* resolved to look those in the face from before whom he fled.

Hence it appears, that "the objection was not as good for preserving the five duties as for retaining the sixth." The repeal of the stamp act and of the five duties have nothing analogous in their motives nor their consequences. And therefore the "ill policy of the former, the mischiefs of which were quite recent," was no small incentive to avoid a repetition of that policy; and to avert the like mischiefs of the last repeal. And now can it be a presumption to say that on the principles of Mr. Cornwall, and of the minister himself, *that* minister had the ample means of answering the supposititious address of your Orator?

Yet such is the confidence of this speaker, "he pronounces that lord North "stands condemned by himself, and by all his associates, old and new, as "a destroyer, in the first trust of finance, of the "revenues; and in the first rank of honour, as a "betrayed of the dignity of his country." Could that minister be a destroyer of his financial trust by repealing duties; that by the American prohibition of importing the commodities, on which they were laid, into the colonies, had been rendered impossible to produce a revenue? can that minister have betrayed the dignity of his country, who hath so vigorously supported the sovereign authority? can such a minister stand condemned by himself and his associates, who hath thus conducted

ducted himself for the nation's welfare? but above all, is it not a stupendous act of confidence that this man, who prompted his master, to destroy the financial trust, by giving up the stamp duty; and to betray the dignity of his country by setting the legislative authority, like a broody goose on chalk eggs, to preserve the appearance of bringing forth, and yet to hatch nothing; that this man, who himself voted for both these indignities, confronted by the actual commission of those crimes which he so falsely imputes to lord North, should calumniate him as a *destroyer* of the *revenues*, and a *betray*er of the *dignity of his country*? Surely his reason was fatigued, when he uttered these words; or all regard to truth, to decency, to his old master and himself had totally deserted him.

And now I will ask on whom the damnation of his proof is fallen? are the ministers with him? are they convinced that neither the repeal of the stamp act, nor any other, either had or could have the consequences which Mr. Cornwall imagined? does the conduct of the ministry give a conclusive answer to that gentleman's objection? is his proof irresistibly carried into the bodies of the ministry? are not all the circumstances he would destroy, like Falstaffe's buckram men, still alive and untouched?

However this confident calumniator of lord North is instantly become "his well-wisher," which it seems his lordship in common with other great men did not know. "he comes to ~~rescue~~ the noble lord "out of the hands of those he calls his friends, and ~~even~~ out of his own." Ah what tenderness of heart does he possess! he is of a sensation so scrupulously delicate, that he cannot drown a kitten, in frosty
C 4 weather,

weather, unless it be in warm water. "He will do his lordship the justice he is denied at home. He has not been this wicked or imprudent man. He knew that a repeal had no tendency to produce the mischiefs which gave so much alarm to Mr. Cornwall. His work was not bad in its principle, but imperfect in its execution; and the motion on the paper presses him only to compleat a proper plan, which by some unfortunate, unaccountable error, he had left unfinished."

And now this minister "who, upon his own *principles*, in the preceding paragraph, had nothing to answer; who stood condemned by himself and his associates, as a *destroyer* of the *revenues*, and a *betray*er of the *dignity* of his *country*, is *not* this wicked and imprudent man, his work was *not* bad in its *principle*, but imperfect in its execution." Such are the contradictions of which this orator stands self condemned. But let me not give him and his associates the occasion of charging me with not understanding his intention; and therefore of misrepresenting him. In the preceding passage, vanity, which never sleeps in his bosom, prompted him to believe that this *palinodia* would *soothe* the minister to comply with that repeal for which he was contending: and yet you have received repeated proofs that nature has not intitled him, by her intellectual favours, to deem his talents to be so superior to those of men, whom he opposes and derides, as to afford him a rational confidence of success.

Such being the event of his damning proof, he now "hopes Mr. Cornwall is thoroughly satisfied, and satisfied out of the proceeding of ministry on their own favourite act, that his fears,

"fears from a repeal are groundless." *Ignorance* then is the mother of *hope*, as she is said to be of devotion. For on what other foundation can that hope be placed? and if Mr. Cornwall be satisfied out of the proceedings of the minister, he is the only man, who understands the subject, that can be thus satisfied, and all his actions pronounce he is not that man.

However, "if *he* be not satisfied, he leaves him and the noble lord who sits by him to settle the matter as well as they can together; for if the repeal of American taxes destroys all our government in America—he is the man!—and he is the worst of all repealers, because he is the last." This is certainly a new discovery. For this *he* must be Mr. Cornwall, or the passage is nonsense; unless he supposes that those *two* make but *one* *he*; and yet till now it was understood to be otherwise; that the minister was the repealer. But whatever *he* be, I intreat you to mind his hypothetical reasoning, "if the repeal of American taxes destroys all our government, he is the worst of all repealers, because he is the last."

But what act has lord North repealed, on which to ground this *if*? the duties on paper, glass, and colours are indeed taken off by a subsequent act, but is the act repealed which first granted them, when it still remains in full force respecting tea? *if* his lordship hath repealed that act, against what does this speaker so virulently *exclaim*? is not the effect produced, which he urges to obtain? has not lord North *perfected* the work which he charges him with having left *imperfect*? *if* he has not repealed it, how can he be deemed the worst of all repealers where no act is repealed? is it not impossible to deter-

mine

mine whether his imagination or his reason, his inventions or his arguments be the more stupendous?

He presumes to be paramount in every human faculty. And having so convincingly displayed his reason and imagination, he now advances to shew the amazing powers of his senses. "I *hear* it rung continually in my ears, *now* and *formerly*," says he, the preamble? what will become of the preamble if you repeal the tax?" What an astonishing degree of perfection has nature given to this sense! he hears *continually* that which is *past*, and that which is *present*. His *now* includes them *both*. It is a hearing devoutly to be wished. And were he not so *over scrupulously delicate*, he might with equal veracity affirm he *now* continually hears *what is to come*. Nor is this sense more exquisite than his others. *In like manner* he sees things both *out of sight* and *in*; smells the *present* and the *last year's rose*; tastes the venison of *this* and the *last* season; and *now* touches the salary which he has not *fingered* these seven years. He exceeds the most wonderful wonder of wonders that ever was wondered at.

But "the preamble! what will become of the preamble if the house repeal this tax." And thus one of the American taxes, the *repeal* of which made lord North, the worst of all the *repealers*, is *not* repealed. "He is *sorry*, however, to be compelled so often to expose the calamities and disgraces of parliament." Such sorrow it is as Mark Antony expressed; when weeping over the dead body of Cæsar he incensed the populace to the destruction of Brutus, and of those who freed their country from that tyrant, whose tyranny that very Antony assisted in establishing.

"The

“ The preamble of this law, he adds, has
 “ the *lie direct* given to it by the provisional
 “ part of the act, if that can be called provisi-
 “ onary which makes no provision, nothing but
 “ truth could give him this firmness; but plain
 “ truth and clear evidence can be beat down by
 “ no ability.” Let me examine into this *plain*
truth and clear evidence. The preamble says, “where-
 “ as it is expedient that a revenue should be raised
 “ in his majesty’s dominions in America, for
 “ making a certain and adequate provision for de-
 “ fraying the charges of the administration of
 “ justice, and support of civil government, in
 “ such provinces where it shall be found necessary,
 “ and towards further defraying the expences of
 “ defending, protecting, and securing the said
 “ dominions.” Such is the preamble, the pro-
 “ visionary part of the act imposes duties on tea,
 “ glass, paper, and painter’s colours, for the pur-
 “ poses abovementioned. And although the duties
 “ be repealed on all but tea, in what manner, even
 “ then, can this provisional part be said to make *no*
 “ provision; or give the *lie direct* to the preamble,
 “ when that duty still remains for further defraying
 “ the preceding expences?”

“ You have heard,” says he, in exultation,
 “ this pompous performance; now where is the
 “ revenue which is to do these mighty things? five
 “ sixths repealed—abandoned—sunk—gone—lost
 “ for ever.” Hence it appears, through a want
 “ of discernment, natural and frequent in this orator,
 “ that he has mistaken the *act*, that *repealed* the five
 “ duties, by which they were sunk, &c. for that
 “ which *imposed* them. And when he can prove that
 “ these *two acts* are *one* and the same, then indeed,
 “ and not till then, the provisional part of that
 “ which

which laid the duties will give the *lie direct* to its own preamble.

It is indeed in the power of legislature to make laws, but has it the power of making them obeyed but by coercion? when those duties were imposed, was it possible for administration to suggest that the Americans could assume the impudence to interdict the importation of the commodities on which they were laid; and prescribe laws to this kingdom respecting what they should and should not export for the colonies, and thereby evade the intention of the British legislature? was it not, at that time as irreconcilable with that constitutional authority which has constantly imposed duties on imported goods, as it is, at present, that any man should defend their outrage, and pretend to love his country? but such being the event, the *revenue* was *gone before* the *repeal* of the five duties. And therefore *no revenue* could be abandoned, sunk, gone, or lost for ever, by that repeal. He then asks, “does the poor solitary tea duty support the *purpose* of this preamble?” for raising a revenue it does not; because the duty has been never paid. But who, except this orator, is so devoid of understanding as not to be convinced that the duties, though expressed for a revenue, were intended to be little more than the ostensible reasons for that act; that the real object was the re-establishment of the supreme authority of the realm. Those taxes were therefore considered as the means of carrying it into execution; and that end this poor solitary tea duty can as effectually obtain as the whole five, or fifty times that number could have done it. He persists, “is not the supply there stated as “effectually abandoned as if the tea duty had “perished in the general wreck?” if this orator, when

when he was posting to Bristol, instead of being robbed of *his* fourteen guineas, had been permitted to retain two pounds fourteen and eightpence of that money, would *his supply* have been as totally taken away, as if he had been deprived of all his guineas? and until he can prove, that five parts in six make the *whole* of a thing, that supply can never be as effectually abandoned, as if the whole six had perished. But I confess this making of *five* parts to be equal to *six* is attended with no more difficulty than the dividing of *one* thing into *three halves*. It shall soon be shewn you, how this poor solitary tea is exalted into a matter of the greatest concern to the commercial interest of this nation.

“ Here, Mr. Speaker,” he *exclaims*, “ is a pre-
 “ cious mockery, a preamble without an act.”
 And yet, in the preceding passage, he asserts that this very act, which is *gone*, does *now* give the *lie* direct to this preamble. “ Taxes,” says he, “ granted in order to be repealed; and the reasons “ of the grant still carefully kept up.” Were these taxes granted to be repealed? and are not the reasons, the true and essential reasons, of the grant still *carefully kept up*, by the preservation of the duty on tea? *this* indeed is not at present: “ raising a revenue in America, but without its “ being kept up.” None can be raised hereafter. It would be in vain to expect obedience to the parliament, after a second renunciation of all the duties. The mischievous effects of the first flagitious dereliction of duty to their country, by abrogating the stamp-act, the former incentives to the present rebellion, irrefragably pronounce, that a repeal of the tea tax would in fact be a sacrifice of this kingdom to the colonies. It stands and is
 as

as perfect a preservation of the dignity of England, as if every tax remained unabrogated.

In what then does "this precious mockery" consist; where is it so amply to be found as in the *act declaratory* of parliamentary right to tax America? a *right*; that by the whole tenor of this speech, as well as by other circumstances, it is expressly shewn, was never intended to be carried into execution. That was indeed a precious mockery! a vile delusion! an inhuman sacrifice of a nation's welfare to the private interest of a few pusillanimous individuals! "If you repeal this tax," he continues, I readily admit that you lose this "fair preamble; estimate your loss in it; the object of the act is gone already, and all you suffer is the purging the statute book of the opprobrium of an *empty*, absurd, and false recital." Such is the value at which he estimates that act which can alone sustain the dignity of this realm! such are the ignominious marks with which he brands it! The beauty of the figure, in which it is expressed, is perfectly adapted to the absurdity of the assertion: *purging* the statute book of the opprobrium of an *empty* recital *full* of absurdity and falsehood. Fertile as his imagination is said to be, by all those who conceive that incongruous images are proofs of a just fancy, he was not the original inventor of that thought. This *empty fullness* was the happy conception of an Irish merchant, who in an entry at a customhouse, among other things, inserted ten *empty* hogheads *full* of salt water.

Mind how he advances in his progress. Having exhibited the accuracy of his reasoning, the justness of his imagination, and the acuteness of his senses, he now comes to manifest his commercial knowledge. "It has been said, again and again, " that

“ that the five taxes were repealed on commercial principles ; it is so said in the paper in my hand, (lord Hillsborough’s circular letter) a paper which I constantly carry about, which I have often used, and shall often use again.” Does he carry it about him as an *agnus dei*, a saint’s relique, to preserve him from injury ? or to what use does he apply it ? “ what is got by this poultry pretence of commerce he knows not, for *if* your government in America is destroyed by the *repeal of taxes* ; it is of no consequence upon what ideas the repeal is grounded ; repeal this tax too upon commercial principles if you please ; these principles will serve as well now as they did formerly.”

I agree with him indeed “ *if* our government in America be destroyed by the *repeal of taxes*, it is of no consequence upon what ideas the repeal is grounded.” But is it not of consequence that our government be preserved by not repealing the tax on tea ? and let me tell him that the commercial principles on which the other duties were repealed, will *not* serve as well in the instance of tea, as in paper, glass, red and white lead, and painter’s colours.

The first principle of all commerce, is the employment of those who labour in our manufactures, and other productions for exportation. And in proportion to the numbers employed will be the increase of national opulence. When the Americans refused to receive into the colonies the manufactures of glass, paper, and the other articles, it was discerned, by the minister, that the diminution of sale in these commodities would lessen the employment of those who worked in producing them. In order therefore to obviate that evil, the taxes
on

on these were repealed, that the exportation might no longer be suspended. But tea employs no British subject either in its culture or preparation. The suspension of that export deprived no manufacturer of his employment. It was therefore reserved. And thus the repeal of the five duties was made on the first and truest of all commercial principles : and that on tea continued with that judgement which does honour to a minister. What then is the issue of this asseveration of this peremptory speaker, " that these commercial principles will serve as well to abrogate the duties on tea as on the other commodities ? " such will inevitably be the event, when men presume to discuss all subjects who are well informed in none. Will he now persist in saying, " that the ministry know, that their objection to a repeal, from these consequences has no validity, or that this pretence," as he calls it, " never could remove it."

Confident in all things, he asserts " this commercial motive never was believed in America, which this letter is meant to soothe, or in England which it is meant to deceive." Thus he daringly presumes to answer for the belief of all America, and all England ; and yet it is nevertheless certain that every commercial man, in those dominions, who reflects one moment on this particular, must be convinced to demonstration, that such was the principle on which these duties were repealed. Notwithstanding this, he avers " it was impossible it should, because every man the least acquainted with the detail of commerce, must know that several of the articles, on which the tax was repealed, were fitter objects of duties than almost any other articles that could possibly
" be

“ be chosen; without comparison more so than
 “ tea, that was left taxed, as infinitely less liable
 “ to be eluded by contraband.” But I have already shown you the motives on which those duties were repealed; and that he who is acquainted with the least detail of trade must know that the duties were not repealed, because the articles were less liable to contraband than tea; but for reasons which you have already heard. And you shall soon be convinced, that this tax on tea must have proved effectually preventive of contraband in that commodity, as well as the repeal must be in some of the others. “ You have, says he, in this kingdom, an advantage in lead that amounts to a
 “ monopoly.” In which *advantageous* monopoly, and in one preparation of that metal, this orator is possessed of a large share. It is in the making of litharge; the *scum* which rises on the surface of lead in *fusion*, and is rendered so *light* as to be *blown* from it by bellows, as fast as it is generated. By the effects of this operation, that metal is changed in colour; and assumes, among the vulgar, the name of litharge of *gold*. Nevertheless it is as equally *lead* as before that process was performed. Such is the nature of that metal, that, although by art you may give it new colours, shapes, and consistencies, it still remains in its substance absolutely unchangeable; and is easily restored to its genuine lumpishness. This orator therefore being so great a monopolist, in this scum of lead, is it not natural for him to be a strenuous advocate in supporting the sale of that commodity?

“ In all the articles of American contraband
 “ trade, says he, who ever heard of the smuggling of red lead, and white lead?” who, indeed! it is a question proper to be asked only by

D

that

that connoisseur in commerce, who ten lines before has told you that this kingdom has a *monopoly* in lead; and that it paid no duty either on export or import. From whence then could it have possibly been smuggled? "some of the things taxed, it seems, were so trivial, that the objects themselves, and their utter annihilation out of American commerce, would have been comparatively as nothing." The *tax* therefore being of *less* value than the *things themselves*, must be comparatively as *less than nothing*; and then this *non-existence* would have been *annihilated* with the commodities, which seems to be attended with some difficulty in the comprehension. "But is the article of tea such an object in the trade of England as not to be felt, or felt but slightly; like white lead, and red lead, and painter's colours? tea is an object of far other importance. Tea is perhaps the most important object, taking it with its necessary connections, of any in the mighty circle of our commerce. If commercial principles had been the true motives to this repeal, or had they been at all attended to, tea would have been the last article we should have left taxed for a subject of controversy."

In his 14th page, he talks of the poor solitary tea duty as unable to support the purposes of raising a revenue. He tells you that five sixths of the duties were abandoned, sunk, gone, lost for ever. It was to his purpose then to lessen the consideration of tea, as I then remarked; and to exalt that of the other articles, as much as possible. But now he pipes another tune, "tea is perhaps the most important object of any in the mighty circle of our commerce." And white lead, and red lead, and painter's colours, which would
 " have

“ have produced, as he says, three fifths of the
 “ five duties repealed, are reduced to objects not
 “ to be felt.” Such is the consistency of this
 mighty man of commerce. But then indeed he
 says of tea, “ taking it with its *necessary* con-
 “ nections,” by which it is manifest he has conceived
 an idea, that a *thing* may be taken, *without* that
 with which it is *necessarily connected*. It is his
 peculiar excellence to conceive that impossibilities
 are practicable. But is *tea* with a *perhaps* and its
connections the most important object of our com-
 merce? are the sugars which it causes to be con-
 sumed, the tea-kettles, and the china cups which
 it employs, of more importance than the ex-
 portation of our woollen, our linnen, our iron,
 or many other manufactures, when neither tea nor
 China ware employ a single manufacturer of this
 realm?

I have already shewn you that the other duties
 were repealed on motives of true commercial prin-
 ciples; that the tax on tea was left from *other* mo-
 tives; and it shall soon be evinced that the duty on
 tea was the only one that ought to have been left,
 when I examine his notions of contraband on
 that particular.

You have now seen with what profundity of
 judgement he is endued, respecting commercial
 matters. And now you shall hear him reprehend and
 reprobate the ministry with as much arrogance and
 licentiousness of tongue, as if the whole system, not
 only of commerce, but of all government, was in-
 terwoven with the fabric of his soul. “ It is not,
 “ says he, a pleasant consideration, but nothing
 “ in the world can *read* so awful and so instructive
 “ a lesson, as the *conduct* of ministry in this bu-
 “ siness, upon the mischief of not having large

“ and liberal ideas in this management of great
“ affairs.”

A *reading conduct*, how beautiful are the proso-
popœias with which his imagination furnishes you! Such are the reprehensions, such the obloquies which are so intrepidly pronounced by this speaker whom you have already seen, without sufficient intellect to comprehend that the first principle of commerce is to employ the people; that tea being no manufacture of this realm, it was of less moment whether it were received in America or not; and that the manufacturing of wool, flax, and iron, by which thousands are supported, are of less importance than tea, which employs no single subject in its making. Even this man so *tethered* in his understanding, arraigns “the conduct of the ministry, and ascribes to them the mischief of not having *large and liberal* ideas in the management of this great affair.” I remember a blind man running against a horse that stood in the street, who damned *it* for *not* being able to *see*.—But such is the misfortune of the minister, he cannot please this exalted genius by doing even what he approves. For he says, “had
“ the true motives to the repeal been attended to,
“ tea would have been the *last* article they should
“ have *left* taxed for a subject of controversy.” This they have done. It is the *last* tax that is *left*, and *it is* the *subject* of his *controversy*. But you shall hear the whole of this antiministerial *exclamation*, that you may draw a just comparison between his presumption and his knowledge. “Never have the servants of the state looked at
“ the *whole* of your complicated interests in one
“ connected view.” Is this an assertion too scrupulously delicate from *one* who, to demonstration,
has

has not understood one circumstance of that which he criticises and reviles? "they have taken things
 " by bits and scraps, some at one time, and some
 " on one pretence, and some at another, just as
 " they pressed, without any sort of regard to their
 " relations or dependencies." Bravely pronounced
 by one who, you are now convinced, does under-
 stand neither *bit*, *scrap*, nor *pretence*, of all the
 affair he explodes. "They never had any kind
 " of system, right or wrong, but only invented
 " occasionally some miserable tale for the day, in
 " order meanly to sneak out of difficulties, into
 " which they had proudly strutted." Truth with
 equal footsteps attends the progress of his assertions.
 Their system has been founded on just principles;
 and as uniformly pursued as the versatility of po-
 litical affairs can possibly permit. It was begun
 to awaken into action that sovereign power, which
 this gentleman and his minister had intentionally
 lulled to eternal sleep, by the opium of their self-
 interest. The duties on the commodities so often
 mentioned, were the means by which it was to be
 exerted in America; when the Americans, with an
 impudence, that no human foresight could divine,
 refused to admit those commodities into their
 ports. The duties laid on the British manufactures
 were repealed, that the labour of the people and
 the benefit of their sales might not be suspended.
 The tax on tea was continued to preserve the
 sovereign authority in actual exercise. When the
 merchants were intimidated from sending teas to
 America, it was done by others, in order to prove,
 by experiment, whether the Americans would dare
 to prevent its importation. The populace grew
 tumultuous on the arrival of the ships; and com-
 mitted felony by destroying the tea. The ma-

gistrates abetted that outrage by a scandalous inattention to their duty; and made no one attempt to punish such atrocious villains. In this state of disobedience to the laws, and to the legislative authority, it was demonstrable that nothing but force could bring them to their duty, and troops were sent as preparatory to that end: but that nothing of cruelty might be justly imputed to your sovereign, his parliament, and his ministers, every merciful attempt to bring them to obedience, and to spare the blood of those even, who by crimes had forfeited their lives, was made. For those who feared no punishment from judges equally rebellious with themselves; and who by that security were prompted to the commission of every outrage, a law was revived to obviate those ideas of illegal safety, by which they might be sent into England and be tried. At the same time, both exportation and importation, respecting Boston, was suspended by parliament. Such was the mercy of the legislative power of Britain, and such it remains, notwithstanding their rebellion hath been since that time aggravated by deputies from the several colonies superseding the provincial legislature, and assuming a privilege to form a general congress, which hath usurped the rights, and renounced the sovereign power of this kingdom. Even since that time means of submission have been proposed replete with clemency. Such is the origin, and such the progress of that system which this orator hath pronounced to have no existence, and to be a miserable tale of a day. And when he talked of *sneaking out of difficulties*, was it through want of reminiscence or want of modesty that he pronounced those words so indisputably applicable to himself and his minister.

“ They were, says he, put to all these shifts
 “ and devices, full of meanness, and full of mis-
 “ chief,

“ chief, in order to pilfer, piece-meal, a repeal
 “ of an act, which they had not the generous
 “ courage, when they had found, and felt their
 “ error, honourably and fairly to disclaim.” The
 imputation of shifts and devices, full of *mean-*
ness, and full of *mischiefs*, the *pilfering*, as he dares
 to call it, of an act piece-meal, have been fairly
 disproved; but if the yielding to the claim of
 rebels be a generous courage, and the surrender
 of the British sovereignty, an honourable and a fair
 disclaimer, they have no support but in the egre-
 gious error, and mischievous transgression com-
 mitted by the Rockingham ministry: a precedent,
 too feeble to sustain the defence of so ruinous a ti-
 midity. And now, in order to exalt these hardy asser-
 tions by a figure equally bold to the knowledge they
 include, he adds, “ by such management, by the
 “ *irresistible* operation of *feeble* councils, so *poultry*
 “ a sum as *three-pence* in the eyes of a financier,
 “ so *insignificant* an article as *tea*, in the eyes of a
 “ philosopher, have shaken the *pillars* of a com-
 “ mercial empire that circled the whole globe.”
 What a deal of mischief this *three-penny* affair
 has done! Ah! what an abominable “destroyer
 in the first trust of the revenues must this lord
 North be, when, by his mal-administration, so
 immense a sum is abandoned—sunk—gone—
 lost for ever!” Such an incomparable passage
 richly deserves a comment. 1. You are presented
 with the *irresistible strength* of *feebleness* that has *no*
 strength at all. 2. That tea, which in the pre-
 ceding page is the most *important* object of the
 British commerce, is here reduced to a *three penny*
 matter, in *finance*, and is become an object of *phi-*
losophy, and 3. this *three pence* hath shaken the pil-
 lars of a commercial empire that circled the globe.

The beauty of this metaphor is truly angelic, it is beyond human comprehension. The British empire consists of this kingdom, Ireland, a few isles which lyè near them, Minorca and Gibraltar, in Europe ; in Asia, of Bengal, part of the Carnatic and Bombay ; in America, of the colonies, and several islands. In what manner these places, which are so many thousand miles asunder, and lyè in such different directions can form a circle, I am at a loss to conceive. And, therefore, the new conception of pillars supporting such portions of the earth can no more form a circle that surrounds the globe than the empire itself. But it has been said, that the ocean forms a part of the British empire. This, indeed, unites the parts of the *solid* empire, and encircles the globe. But an *ocean* supported on pillars ? how beautiful would it appear in painting ! as the celebrated speakers of ancient and modern days, by *tropes* and *figures*, added wings to their orations that bore them into the sublimity of the skies, so does this speaker, of equal excellence in his kind, hang them on as weights to expedite his descent into the immeasurable depths of the vast *profound*.*

“ Do you forget, says he, that on the very last
 “ year you stood on the precipice of general bank-
 “ ruptcy ? Your danger was, indeed, great ; you
 “ were distressed in the affairs of the East India
 “ company, and, you well know what sort of
 “ things are involved in the comprehensive ener-
 “ gy of that significant appellation.” That the
 East India company were in some danger of a
 bankruptcy two years since ; and that the govern-
 ment supported them is well enough known. But
 that

* Bathos. chap. 10. the jargon.

that the nation was on the precipice of a bankruptcy can never be remembered, because it did never exist; and, therefore, it can never be forgotten, unless ministers have the special gift of forgetting what they never could have known. With what unremitting ardor does he support the style figurative? The *involution* of things in the *comprehensive* energy of a *word*, that signifies the appellation of the East India company. If the Commons, or Ministry, do well know the *meaning* of these words, I verily believe they know more than the orator who spoke them. I frankly confess my ignorance. However, it is an admirable expedient in a speaker, who wants ideas, to *involve* his meaning in the unintelligible *energy* of sonorous phraseology.

He continues, "The monopoly of the most
 " lucrative trades, and the possession of imperial
 " revenues had brought the ministry to the ve-
 " ry verge of beggary and ruin. Such was their
 " representation - such, in some measure, was
 " their case." From these words, you cannot but
 infer that the ministry are solely possessed of the
 East India trade; and that the Asiatic revenues are
 received by them. Is the East India company anni-
 hilated? Could the ministry represent that they
 were brought to the very verge of beggary and
 ruin? Could that be, in some measure, the case
 when they had nothing to do with the profits of
 the trade, nor with the revenue, but that of re-
 linquishing the four hundred thousand pounds a
 year which the company was to pay them out of
 a revenue of four millions? This speech appears to
 be calculated for the Speakers in Leadenhall-street;
 and is manifestly misapplied in the house of Com-
 mons: "The vent of ten millions of pounds of
 " this commodity, says he, now locked up, by
 " the

“ the operation of an injudicious tax, and rotting
 “ in the warehouses of the company, would have
 “ prevented all this distress, and all that series of
 “ desperate measures which the ministry thought
 “ themselves obliged to take in consequence of
 “ it.” Here again, the three-penny matter of tea
 is raised to a two millions and a half of money,
 the duty of which would be one hundred and
 twenty-five thousand pounds. For the first sum,
 at five shillings per pound weight, on an average,
 is its value; and the second the duty it would have
 produced at three-pence a pound. Thus, the im-
 portance of this commodity sinks and rises occasi-
 onally; and the orator *, like a didapper, is either
 above or under water, as it best suits his purpose.

But let me examine a little into the merit of this
 terrifying account of rotting tea. In page 36, he
 tells you that the American consumption of teas is
 annually 300,000*l.* at the least farthing, by
 which he *means worth* that sum. This if esti-
 mated, at an average, of five shillings the pound;
 the quantity, which answers to the preceeding
 sum of 300,000*l.* will be annually 1,250,000
 pounds weight; one-eighth of the ten millions.
 Hence it results, that there now lies rotting in the
 warehouses a quantity of tea equal to an eight years
 supply for America, accumulated by the East-
 India company in seven years, six of which they
 knew that the Americans would not receive it.
 These ten millions of tea, packed in the largest
 chests and which therefore contain the greatest
 quantity in the least space, would fill 30,000
 chests. If you enquire of a director where these
 † rot-

* Bathos. ch. 6. Didapper.

rotting millions of tea, and thousands of chests may lie, he laughs in your face; and assures you that there is not an ounce of tea rotting, at this time, more than usual; and that neither the teas nor the chests are in their warehouses. But sir, says the querist, the celebrated speaker Mr. Burke hath asserted the first, and consequently the second, in parliament. Oh, I understand you, says he, they are concealed with the army of prince Volscius in the inns at Knightsbridge.

Audacious as it may appear, I shall venture to affirm, that on the 19th of last April, when this speech was spoken; and on the day when it was printed also, there were not more than ten millions of tea in the East-India warehouses, for the consumption of Great Britain, Ireland, the islands; America; and of all other places to which tea is exported; of which the colonies now in rebellion, do not consume more than a seventh part. And as it is a well known truth, that the company must necessarily have nearly a two years supply of tea constantly in hand, by what means can ten millions out of ten millions be now rotting in the India warehouses, which would have been sent to America; and yet a sufficient supply remain for all the other dominions of this realm?

“ America, however, would have furnished that
 “ vent, which *no* other part of the world can fur-
 “ nish, *but* America;” that is *except* America.
 And thus *America* and *itself* are two different things.
 Unless the *same thing* can be an *exception to itself*.
 This admirable passage exemplifies the *profundity*
 of this gentleman’s studies. He hath taken it from
 that celebrated work in which he delighteth; and
 in imitation of another *show-man*, who wrote over
 the

the picture of his elephant, *this is the greatest elephant in the world except himself.**

“ Tea in America is next to a necessary of life ;
 “ and where the demand grows upon the supply.”
 This also is a new discovery in commerce, and contrary to the opinion of all other men. For from this observation it follows, the more there is of a commodity at market, the greater is the demand for it; and a supply is the more wanted. America therefore can take not only all the tea that is brought to England, but all that China can produce. Because the faster the Americans are supplied, the more they demand it. This I believe is a phenomenon so singular in the American commerce, that although I am as convinced of the truth of it as of any thing in Mr. Burke’s oration; yet I am told that the merchants are in some doubt, were the import of tea open in America, whether it would be prudent, notwithstanding the respectableness of Mr. Burke’s opinion, to send tea to that part of the world, if they heard there was a sufficiency for a year’s consumption.

He is constantly improving in the exhibitions of his commercial learning; “ I hope, says he,
 “ our dear bought East-India committees have
 “ done at least so much good as to let us know,
 “ that without a more extensive sale of that article,
 “ our East-India revenue and acquisitions can have
 “ no certain connection with this country. It is
 “ through the American trade of tea, that your
 “ East-India conquests are to be prevented from
 “ crushing you with their burthen. They are
 “ ponderous indeed; and they must have that
 “ great country to lean upon, or they tumble up-
 “ on

* Bathos. ch. 7. Of the profound when it consults in the *thought*.

“ on your head.” How *dearly* these committees were bought, or *who paid* them I know not; but this I know. It is a mortifying incident to a man, to be left out in a *purchase*, who has been used to be included in those on East-India subjects.

In this instance, this universal and comprehensive genius appears to be mistaken; not only in his notions of the East-India trade, but in those of geography also. Otherwise, can he suppose that the revenues and acquisitions of Bengal and the Carnatic can have no certain connection with this country, but through the American trade of tea? Do these provinces lie in China, and pay their revenues in that commodity? it has hitherto been thought that the revenue is paid in silver in Bengal, and thence carried to China to purchase teas. And could not that silver be brought to England but through the American trade of tea? can the trade of that tea to America, amounting only to a seventh part of the annual sale, prevent this kingdom from being crushed by the burthen of our East-India conquests? but the metaphor is admirable beyond comparison. “These ponderous conquests in Asia must have the great country of *America* to *lean* upon, or they tumble upon your heads.” If you understand *lean* as a *trope* to express *lie*, then he has supposed these Asiatic conquests must be carried, by sea I presume, some thousand leagues, and placed on the colonies in America, where they will lie, one upon another, like pancakes in a dish. And then our heads will be effectually secured from being tumbled on; and ourselves from being crushed by their burthen. If by the word *lean*, he means to give personality to our Indian conquests, then he must suppose that, by *leaning* on the provinces of America, per-
sonified

sonified also, they will be prevented from falling on our heads in England, which is certainly a fact; for if they *lean* there, should their props fail them, they can never *fall* here, be they as ponderous as they may.

“It is the same folly that has lost you the benefit of the West, and of the East,” says he, “this folly has thrown open folding doors to contraband, and will be the means of giving the profits of the trade of your colonies to every nation but yourselves.” I appeal to experience for the falsity of having lost the benefit of our eastern trade. And if the Americans are not reduced to obedience, I will allow him that of the West. But nothing in contention can be lost until the contest be decided. And does he conceive the Americans can defeat our troops; the provinces become separate states; and in spite of our fleets trade with other nations? but you shall soon be shown that his knowledge of the contraband trade in America, is equal to that which he has exhibited respecting that of Asia. He continues to exclaim “never did a people suffer so much for the empty words of a preamble. It must be given up.” I wish the orator had explained in what these sufferings consist. Not in the loss of the East-India trade it is self-evident; and the present interruption to that with the provinces hath hitherto been the parent of very little sufferings. We have seen an application from Birmingham, and another from the clothiers in the West of England, approving the conduct of the ministers, and petitioning for a continuance of their attempts to subdue the refractory spirit of rebellion in America. We have seen from Leeds in Yorkshire, in contradiction to a letter promulgated by a quaker, that the decline
of

of trade was not more, at that time, than usual. All these are places of manufacturing as considerable as any in England. Is it natural for men to suffer, and to petition for the continuation of those measures by which they are oppressed? where then are your sufferings? but alas! such must be your fate, for according to this speaker it is irremediable. I presume the *words* of the preamble make the preamble itself. If the words be *empty*, they have no *meaning*. How then can a preamble that means *nothing* be given up? have you, till this time ever heard of a *surrender of nothing at all*? he then asks, "on what principle does it stand?" indeed I never could have answered this question because I have never conceived that *emptiness* could stand upon *any thing*. Happily, and according to his usual benignity he answers himself. "This famous revenue stands, at this hour, *on all the debate*, as a description of a revenue not as yet known in all the comprehensive (but too comprehensive) vocabulary of finance—a *preambulary tax*." Hence it is plain, that the *empty* preamble is synonymous with the revenue, or *preambulary tax*. And thus this tax, which *walks before itself*, does nevertheless stand as a revenue *on all the debate*. And thus the *debate* is the *principle* on which it stands. But it seems nevertheless that this *preambulatory* tax does not stand as a revenue on its *principle* the *debate*, but as a *description* of revenue not yet known in the vocabulary of finance. The *description* is its *locum tenens*. And yet it is a *description unknown* in all the too comprehensive vocabulary of finance. A *word book* of finance is a new production. It is indeed as singular as this speech, it is too
com-

comprehensive, and yet it does not *comprehend* the *description* which ought to be in it.* May not this notion of a *description* standing as a *locum tenens* in place of a reality be usefully applicable by the lord mayor and aldermen of London? for example, may not the former send his pourtrait or statue in brass as a *thing* to supply the absence of himself, and the presence of an alderman, and all things proceed as well as if both of them were present? Surely such unintelligible and contradictory circumlocution was never heard before this exhibition of our orator. But let me risk a presumption to understand his intent, and suppose the whole of this pompous periphrase to signify that the tax is in the preamble, and such as was not known before. He hath already told you of what this preamble consists, "that it is expedient
 " that a revenue should be raised in America for
 " making a more certain provision for defraying
 " the charge of the administration, of justice,
 " the support of civil government, and towards
 " defending, protecting, and securing the said
 " dominions."

Do you find this tax in the *preamble*? the preamble declares for what ends it was to be raised, and no more. And from that alone it is impossible to learn what tax is. Unless Mr. Burke can see at Cannon: what was never there, and find something

* Bathos. ch. 11. *Macrology* and *pleonasm* are as generally coupled as a lean with a fat rabbit; nor is it a wonder the superfluity of words and vacuity or sense being just the same thing. ch. 12. The expression is adequate when it is proportionably low to the profundity of the thought. It must not be always grammatical, lest it appear pedantic and ungentelemanly: nor too clear for fear it become vulgar: for obscurity bestows a cast of the wonderful, and throws an oracular dignity on a piece that hath no meaning.

thing *in* a box which it does *not* contain. The tax in this, as in all other acts, is in the body of the statute ; and this preamble, which contains the *description* of a revenue that is *not* described, like all other preambles, declares the purposes for which the tax is to be levied. And surely such a preamble is not unknown to the nation ; although it may be wanting in the *too comprehensive* vocabulary of this speaker's financial knowledge.

Mark how he kindles, like the axle of a loaded cart, from ponderosity and friction. How beautifully he amplifies on this *preambulary tax*. " It is indeed a tax of sophistry, a tax of pedantry, a tax of disputation, a tax of war and rebellion, a tax for any thing but benefit to the imposers, or satisfaction to the subject." If you adhere to the grammatical meaning of these words, this tax is a taxation of *sophistry*, of *pedantry*, of *disputation*, of *war* and *rebellion* ; and then envy must confess that this gentleman is fully justified in *exclaiming* so violently against that tax to which he must be so great a contributor. But then the word *tea* must be synonymous with all *these*, which I believe does not appear in the vocabulary of finance. The preceding passage will however grammatically admit another sense ; that this tea duty was imposed by *sophistry*, *pedantry*, *disputation*, *war*, and *rebellion*. And then the speakers, at least, if not all who voted for this tax, are consequently *sophistical*, *pedantic*, *disputations*, *war-like*, *rebellious* subjects. But as it is the indigenious and innate right of this speaker, to say one thing and to mean another ; as his heritage is large, and he bestows it with the genuine spirit of true Irish hospitality ; as he has a just claim to that right also by the parliamentary precedent of dividing a sub-

ject into three halves ; perhaps he may mean that this tax *has been productive* of *sophistry, pedantry, disputation, war, and rebellion*.—It has indeed been productive of sophistry, pedantry, and disputation, to the proof of which I subpœna no evidence but this speech. As to war and rebellion, those were produced by speeches in parliament, in opposition to the stamp-act, and fostered by the repeal of it. However, to be *partly* right, is so much a novelty in this speaker ; that I intreat you to place the merit of it to his account.

“ Well, says he, but whatever it is gentlemen
 “ will force the colonies to take the tea, you will
 “ force them? has seven years struggle been able
 “ to force them? oh ! but it seems we are in the
 “ right, the tax is trifling---in effect it is rather an
 “ exoneration than an imposition, three fourths of
 “ the duty formerly payable on teas exported to
 “ America is taken off; the place of collection is
 “ only shifted ; instead of the retention of a shil-
 “ ling from the draw-back here, it is three-pence
 “ custom paid in America. All this is very
 “ true, but this is the very folly and mischief of
 “ the act. Incredible as it may seem, the mi-
 “ nistry know that they have deliberately thrown
 “ away a large duty which they held secure and
 “ quiet in their hands, for the vain hope of get-
 “ ting one three fourths less, through every ha-
 “ zard, through certain litigation, and possibly
 “ through war.”

I shall not examine any farther into the folly and mischief of the act, it has been already evinced that the true motive to enacting it was the reviving of the sovereign authority of Britain in America ; that the revenue was the ostensible
 reason,

reason, and the means of exerting that supreme power. But without having recourse to those particulars, I will examine it as a revenue act alone. Before the time of its being passed, every pound of tea, that was exported to America, went from England one shilling dearer, than after the act was made. This shilling was taken off, and on the teas being landed in America they paid three-pence per pound weight. Teas that, since the alteration, may be exported at half a crown a pound. were, before it, with the shilling, at the price of three and six-pence. The same teas, with the three-pence duty, are now worth two shillings and nine-pence in the colonies. The Americans paying the former shilling duty in the price, paid forty per cent. on the teas of two and six-pence per pound. They now pay ten. And as the teas exported increased in prime cost, this shilling gradually decreased from forty to ten per cent. on teas between half a crown and ten shillings a pound. At present with the duty of three-pence, they decrease from ten to two and a half per cent. The profits, by evading the payment of the shilling, or forty per cent. on those teas which are chiefly demanded in America, as well as the evasion of the proportion of it in teas of all prices, were an incentive to smuggling too strong to be resisted; and the contraband in that article being consequently very great on that account, the export of tea from England to the colonies was vastly inferior to the consumption of it in America. Administration therefore on the established and true principles of trade and finance, concluded that three-pence per pound, on all teas, would render the smuggling of them so little advantageous, that it would be no longer pursued. And consequently that the small duty, by increase

of sale, would more than compensate for that of the large that was taken away. The tax therefore is indeed both trifling, and an exoneration. But where is the folly, where the mischief that has been done by the ministry, in thus diminishing this tax? how have the ministry deliberately thrown away a large duty, which they held in their hands, for the vain hope of getting three fourths less. Does it not, as this speaker says, seem incredible, that he should be so definitive and peremptory in the reprehension of that which he so little understands? the ministry indeed might easily foresee that the principles which had been propagated by the American advocates in parliament, might create litigation; but could they believe that the colonies would dare to oppose a tax on importation, which had been the usual and undisturbed practice from the time of king William to the day on which that tax was imposed? At least they resolved to restore the sovereign power, which had been abandoned, through every hazard, even to war; *they* have the dignity of their country at heart, and *they* will not timidly yield to the demands of rebellion.

The folly and mischief imputed to the ministry, may now seem to be transferred to him that pronounced it, of which a further confirmation will arise from the following assertion. “The manner of
 “proceeding in the duties on paper and glass, im-
 “posed by the same act, was exactly in the same
 “spirit. There are heavy excises on those arti-
 “cles, when used in England. On export, these
 “excises are drawn back; but instead of with-
 “holding the draw-back, which might have been
 “done, without possibility of smuggling; and
 “instead of applying the money (money already
 “in

“ in their hands) according to their pleasure, they
 “ began their operations in finance, by flinging
 “ away the revenue ; they allowed the whole
 “ draw-back on export, and then they charged
 “ the duty (which they had before discharged) pay-
 “ able in the colonies, where it is certain the col-
 “ lection would devour it to the bone, if any
 “ revenue were ever suffered to be collected.
 “ One spirit pervades and animates the whole
 “ mass.”

This opinion of our orator in this instance is
 exactly in the same spirit of commercial know-
 ledge with the preceding. He tells you there are
 heavy excises on paper and glass, which on export
 are drawn back ; that these might have been with-
 held with ease by the ministry, and that they be-
 gun with flinging away a revenue in their hands,
 when he has this moment told you that no such re-
 venue existed, the excises being drawn back on
 exportation. However his meaning is that the
 withholding of heavy excises in England, on
 glass and paper, which must be paid by the co-
 lonists in the price of them, is a more judicious
 mode than laying a small tax on them, to be paid
 in America. And this he says might have been done
 without a possibility of smuggling. That the desire
 of evading the payment of these *heavy excises* on the
 preceding commodities, would naturally excite the
 practice of contraband, he will hardly deny. But
 it seems such an illicit trade is impossible. Yet paper
 and German glass are to be exported from Holland
 at a much less price than they are from England,
 after the draw-back is allowed. St. Eustatia and
 Curaçoe are Dutch islands, from whence a variety
 of merchandise is smuggled into America. Had
 the *heavy excises* been retained in England, when

these commodities were exported to America, would not that aggravation of price have proved to be an incitement to smuggling, and have overcome this orator's *impossibility*; have thrown open folding-doors to contraband; and instead of enabling the ministry to keep those excises, as a revenue in the hands of government, would it not have annihilated the American sale of the commodities on which they were laid; and have transferred that money, which before came here, into the Dutch dominions? even the small duty, imposed on these commodities, when imported into America, manifestly tending to promote a contraband, was one among the commercial motives that induced the present ministry to repeal those duties. Where now is the folly to be placed? but it appears that this gentleman's ideas of contraband are, that the greater the *profits* of *smuggling*, the *less* will be the *incitement* to contraband. Is he not always mistaking the hatchet for the helve, and cutting his fingers by handling what he does not understand? *does not one spirit pervade and animate his whole mass?*

" Could any thing, says he, be a subject of
 " more just alarm to America, than to see the
 " ministry go out of the plain high road of fi-
 " nances, and give up the most certain revenues
 " and the clearest interests, merely for the sake of
 " insulting the colonies?" but such is the truth
 that *lowering* the duty on *tea*, and not imposing
 duties on things which other nations can more
 cheaply supply, are the certain ways of increasing
 a revenue, and the interests of a nation. And
 would it not, on that account, have been going
 out of the plain road of finance, to have withheld
 the excises which had been constantly drawn back
 on

on export ? and in what manner were the colonists insulted by the exercise of that power, of laying duties on American imports, which had been in continual usage since the day on which the Bostonians received their charter from William the third ? even that authority which this gentleman's minister produced a declaratory act to justify and establish ; which *he* advised, and on the rectitude of which *he* spoke. " No man, says he, ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of three-pence." Then why does he *exclaim* against the ministry who imposed it ? but he adds " no commodity will bear three-pence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated, and two millions of people are resolved not to pay." I should imagine, unless the commodity had feelings like the people, it might bear it well enough. But I conclude that he means, if two millions of men are irritated, and are resolved *not* to pay, why then they will not pay. And therefore, as the law directs, and the duty of administration requires, they must be compelled to it by the executive power. For if no taxes were paid, but such as men would be willing to pay, I fancy the government would have but a scanty revenue.

" The feelings of the colonies were formerly the feelings of Great-Britain." It is indisputably true, that when the colonies were distressed, Great Britain hath always *felt* for them ; witness the seventy millions she ran in debt to support them in the last war ; witness the numbers of Britons that perished in her cause ; witness the ready attention she hath ever paid to all things that might promote their interest. But the *feelings* of *Great Britain* have *not* been those of the *colonies*, for with

the immense advantages which they acquired by the peace, the traitorous ingrates now refuse constitutionally to contribute to the support of their own governments.

The gentleman having thus exhibited unparalleled proofs how perfectly he is instructed in the subject of commerce, takes an occasion to display his knowledge in the history of *this* country. "Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden, when called upon for the payment of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? no! but the payment of twenty shillings, on the principle it was paid, would have made him a slave. It is the weight of that preamble, of which you are so fond, and not the weight of the duty that the Americans are unable and unwilling to bear."

Let me examine into this identity of feelings in Mr. Hampden and the Americans. Charles the first and his ministers, by an exertion of the prerogative royal, commanded his officers to collect the tax of ship money. Mr. Hampden insisted that the king had no right to raise money in that manner; because none but the sovereign authority of parliament could impose a duty on the subjects of England. And therefore the proclamation of the king being illegal and arbitrary, he would not comply with that demand.

The parliament of this realm have enacted a tax to be paid by the American subjects. These Americans refuse to obey the law because, as they aver, by the charters of former kings, they are exempted from paying any tax but what they impose on themselves. In Great Britain, none but the parliament can legally levy a tax, and every exertion

exertion of that kind in a sovereign is tyranny. In America, none but the king can impart the right of imposing a duty, and it is tyranny in the legislative power of this realm to levy it. Mr. Hampden, in obeying the king's prerogative, would have been a slave, and free under a parliamentary taxation in England. The Americans are slaves if they obey the parliament, and free under the prerogative royal. Thus the constitution of this realm is made to conform to the different inclinations of the subjects, as foxes in the most northern climates change colour according to the seasons. For if the king, by charter, can grant the right of imposing taxes, to his American subjects, and thereby free them from the obligation of being obedient to the acts of the British legislature, then is he superior to himself and his parliament; and the tax of ship money was no illegal demand. For certainly he that can justly annihilate the parliamentary power over his subjects in America, can raise a tax in this kingdom without their consent. But you all know that a British sovereign has no right to tax you by his prerogative; and therefore he can never transfer, by charter, to the Americans, that *right* which he does *not* possess, *an exemption from being taxed by a British parliament*. This truth is evinced by every charter that has been granted to the cities and towns of England, and even to the colonies themselves. Every law they make, repugnant to the laws of England is expressly null and void? can they therefore be possessed of a right to make laws, and not to apply them? does not the same power which annihilates such laws, absolutely pronounce that they can have no right to make them? they have all a right to raise on themselves what money they

they please for their own use ; yet are they nevertheless as much obliged to pay the taxes of the state as those who are not incorporated by charters. Such is precisely the case of the colonies and of all other corporations ?

What ideas then does our orator entertain of the identity, or even similitude of feelings, between Hampden and the colonists ? can the same feelings arise from causes so irreconcilably contradictory ? are the equator and the meridian circles less parallel than these cases of Hampden and the colonists ? what motive could have led him to illustrate his subject by an instance which in every point directly opposes what he intended to establish ? this is indeed "*underpinning with clumsy but-teresses a pillar which they overthrow.*" And thus you see his skill in reasoning by analogy is equal to his logical induction, and his knowledge of history to that of commerce. And now you may talk as you will of the mulberry tree, commend me to a bit of shillalah.*

However "it is the weight of the preamble, and not the weight of the duty that the Americans are unable and unwilling to bear." They *can bear the tax*, but *will not bear the weight of the preamble*. This weight consists in the raising a revenue in support of the administration of justice, of the civil government, and for defending, protecting, and securing themselves and their properties. This it seems they *can* and ought to bear, and *will not*. This also is indeed a new method of defence by bringing proof to the contrary of what he intended. These Americans who trumpet their loyalty so loudly in all their rebellious

* Irishman in the *Jubilee*.

ous publications, it seems *can* but *will not* contribute to the support of *themselves*. You and I and all the subjects of Great Britain and Ireland are not only to discharge the interest of seventy millions, borrowed to save them from destruction in the last war, but to support them for the future without their contributing but what they please to their own preservation, both in civil and military departments. *They* are to be exempted from the controul of the legislature, and *you* obliged to obey it. *They* are to be *free* from *imposts*, and *you* to be unremittingly *oppressed* for *them*. In fact, they are to be your *masters*, and you their *slaves*. *They* are to wanton in ease and voluptuousness, and *you* to labour for the supporting of them. Such are the purposes which this orator and his confederates are labouring to establish. And under the delusive terms of supporting *liberty* in *America*, actually to *enslave* you in *England*. Will you, descended from ancestors who disdained to be enthralled by *sovereigns*, submit to the bondage of *men* generated from those who were either by principle and by practice enemies to your constitution; or from *such*, as having forfeited their lives by felony, in this kingdom, were transported to the colonies? it cannot be! “It is, says he, upon the *principle* “of this measure, and nothing else, that we are “at issue; it is a principle of political expediency.” It is indeed the expediency of re-establishing the legislative authority in *America*, so industriously concealed from you through his long harangue. “The act of 1767 asserts that it “is expedient to raise a revenue in *America*; the “act of 1769, which takes away that revenue, “contradicts the act of 1767, and by something “much stronger than words, asserts, that it is not
“ ex-

"expedient." The former act asserts it is *expedient*, that is *fit*, *proper*, to raise a revenue; the taxes were the means by which it was to be raised. The act of 1769 repeals five of these duties, for commercial reasons already assigned. The tax on tea still remains. Now in what sense can the *repeal* of duties *contradict* the *fitness* and *properness* of raising a revenue? the repeal brings no proof, but that the means were improper for the end, and therefore repealed. But the expediency, the fitness of raising a revenue subsists as much before as after. Is it not expedient, that all artisans should live by their labour, but if by any incident or design, their employment be taken from them, does that event contradict the expediency, the fitness, the properness, that these men should live by their labour? I am apprehensive then that this orator either does not understand the word *expedient*, or that he draws a conclusion which is the reverse of logical induction, like a Welch groom that carries the horse from the *head* to the *tail*, and then wipes him backwards from the *tail* to the *head*.

He comes now to arraign the wisdom of parliament. "It is a reflection upon your wisdom to persist in a solemn parliamentary declaration of the expediency of any object, for which, at the same time you make no provision." Surely the gentleman has not exhibited much wisdom in this assertion. Whilst the Americans are in rebellion, and will submit to no law made in England, can it be a *reflection* on the wisdom of parliament that they make *no* provision, when it is certain, that *none* can be made? is it a *reflection* on their wisdom to persist in the declaration of their *fitness* of an *object* which *ought* to be obtained? if by any means the usual supply of provisions for the city

of London should be withheld by Bakers, Brewers, Butchers, &c. would it be a reflection on the wisdom of parliament to declare the *expediency* of the several objects for supporting life, because the men above-mentioned would not bring their commodities to market? would not parliament behave, in that case, as they do in the present, compel those fellows to supply the markets; or permit the people to take the provisions without their consent? has this *speaker* been so conversant in Ecclesiastes and the books of Solomon, that he can, with justice, so confidently reprehend the *wisdom* of parliament?

He now intreats the Commons to attend with more particular care. “ Pray, let not this circumstance escape you; it is very material; that the preamble of this act, which he wishes to repeal, is not *declaratory of a right*, as some gentlemen seem to argue it; it is only a recital of the *expediency* of a certain exercise of a right, supposed already to have been asserted; an exercise they are now contending for by ways and means, which they confess, though they were obeyed, to be utterly insufficient for their purpose.” Can it be material to tell the house, that an act, which was *never* intended to be *declaratory*, is *not* that which it was *not* intended to be; because some gentlemen *seem* to think so? This preamble, which he has already declared to contain a revenue, a description of a revenue, a tax of sophistry, pedantry, disputation, war and rebellion, which must be given up, “is now *only* a recital of an expediency of a certain exercise of a right supposed already to have been asserted.” And thus he confesses, that this preamble does contain a recital of the expediency of exercising
the

the legislative authority of this realm. Is it a right *supposed* to have been asserted, when the records of parliament *pronounce* it *has been exerted* from the revolution to that act to which he refers? A right *supposed*, after *his* master had obtained, and *he* had voted for an *act declaratory* of that very right. As to the confession of the commons, or the ministry, that if the "ways and means for which they are contending were obeyed, they would be utterly insufficient." As he quotes no such confession, I shall suspend my belief. For it has been sufficiently evinced that this orator is capable of mistakes. And now for the conclusion from his premises, "you are therefore at this moment in the awkward situation of fighting for a phantom, a quiddity; a thing that wants not only a substance, but even a name; for a thing which is neither abstract, right, nor profitable enjoyment." Such is this gentleman's idea of the sovereign legislative power of this kingdom. And now it results, that this terrible preamble, which must be repealed, because it contained the tea duty, does really contain nothing at all, neither *name* nor *substance*. I wish he had instructed the house in the manner of repealing *nothing at all*; *the file affords no precedent*. And thus from his own lips it appears that these ministers, who are so extremely criminal, in not having repealed this preamble, have *nothing* to repeal; and that this orator hath been haranguing upon *nothing at all* through such a prolix profusion of verbosity. Thus the matter so *material*, the escape of which the house was prayed not to permit, ends in quips and quiddities, phantoms, and things without name or substance; and then what need was there of adding, that a *nothing* was

was neither abstract, right, nor profitable enjoyment ?

“ They tell you, says he, that your dignity is tied to it, but he knows not how it happens, but this dignity is a terrible incumbrance to you ; for it has of late been ever at war with your interest, your equity, and every idea of your policy. Shew the thing you contend for to be reason ; shew it to be common sense ; shew it to be the means of attaining some useful end ; and then he is content to allow it what dignity you please. But what dignity is derived from the perseverance in absurdity is more than ever he could discern.” This challenge I shall presume to answer, and to shew the thing contended for, to be *reason, common sense*, and to attain some *useful end*. Is not the support of the sovereign authority of this realm an object of dignity ? is it not the interest of the whole nation that it should be supported ? Is it not equitable that the Americans should obey this power, and contribute to the supplies of money which are requisite for administering justice and defending themselves ? are these things at war with every idea of British policy ? how then is this *dignity* at war with the preceding things ? is it not therefore shewn that it is both reason, common sense, and to the attainment of some useful end ? let him therefore prove that these particulars are otherwise, or allow them that dignity which they truly deserve. However, that he cannot discern what *dignity* is derived from the perseverance in absurdity, I do verily believe ; for if he had possessed that talent, this speech would neither have been spoken nor printed.

It must be confessed, however, that what he wants either in candour and discernment, is amply compensated

penfated by his confidence. For in plain Englifh, the preceding paſſage expreſſes nothing leſs than, that the commons are a pack of fellows ſo ignorant they know not their *own intereſt*, their *own equity*, nor have they *one idea* of their *own policy*. That they are contending for what has neither *reaſon* nor *common ſenſe*, nor *one uſeful end*; and that their whole conduct is a *perſeverance in abſurdity*. It muſt be remarked that this becoming paſſage was ſpoken of the laſt parliament. Of the preſent, he has not printed his opinion.

He then tells you, that “ Mr. Cornwall has ſaid
 “ that this ſubject does not ſtand now as it did
 “ formerly. Oh! certainly not; every hour they
 “ continue on this ill-chosen ground, their diffi-
 “ culties thicken on them; and therefore his con-
 “ cluſion is, remove from a bad poſition as quickly
 “ as you can, the diſgrace and the neceſſity of
 “ yielding, both of them grow upon them every
 “ hour of their delay.” This reminds me of the ſon of Æolus, whom his father inſtructed in the ſecret of incloſing the winds in leathern bottles, which he was to ſell to thoſe who might want his commodity. But as he had but little demand for his merchandiſe in the iſland in which he was born, near Great Britain, he travelled to Bætica; in which kingdom wealth abounded, in hopes of ſelling his *wind* for ſubſtantial riches. His method was to perſuade them to reſign their gold, and to rely on their imaginations for being enriched by him. In this perſuaſion he diſtributed a large part of his *wind*. They at length believed; and were thereby deprived of three parts in four of their wealth. Such was the *windy* influence of the ſon of Æolus. Perhaps a ſimilar intention might have engaged our orator to part with his *wind*, in order


to delude the parliament and the ministers from their undertakings, respecting America. He is understood as delivering the subsequent words. Commons and ministers follow the example which was set you by my minister, and by my advice; repeal the duty on tea, as the stamp-act was abrogated, in obedience to the rebellious demands of the Americans; sacrifice the rights of parliament; dishonour the king's dignity; betray the trust of administration which is reposed in you; set the Americans in an independency of the legislature, and free from taxation; and continue to oppress the subjects of England by new imposts on their account. Otherwise your difficulties will thicken upon you, your disgrace and the necessity of yielding will grow upon you every hour. But neither the commons nor the ministry were otherwise moved by his *wind*, than to deride the proposal. They saw the inclination and the ends which urged him to the attempt of bringing *them* to a repetition of the follies above recited. But they discerned not the desire of yielding to the Americans, nor the disgrace of defending all that dignity which the Rockingham ministry so timidly resigned.

He continues, "but will you repeal the act; says Mr. Cornwall, at this instant, when America is in open resistance? he thinks he has driven them into a corner; but thus pent up, he is content to meet him, because he enters the lists supported by his old authority, Mr. Cornwall's new friends, the ministry themselves." It is indeed an heroic act of chivalry. This oratoric champion, pent up in a corner, supported by the ministry, Mr. Cornwall's new friends, is content to meet that gentleman, who, if that be
F
true,

true, has no one to assist him. You shall hear the defence he makes. " Mr. Cornwall remembers " that about five years ago, as great disturbances, " as the present, prevailed in America, on account of the new taxes. The ministry represented these disturbances as treasonable; and " this house, thought proper, on that representation, to make a famous address for a revival, and for a new application of a statute of " Henry VIII. The commons besought the king, " in that well considered address, to enquire into treasons; and to bring the supposed traitors " from America to Great Britain for trial. His " majesty was pleased graciously to promise a " compliance with their request. All the attempts from this side of the house, to resist " those violences, and to bring about a repeal, " were treated with the utmost scorn. An apprehension of the very consequences now stated " by Mr. Cornwall, was then given for shutting " the door against all hope of accommodation. " And so strong was the spirit of the " new taxes, that the session concluded with the " following remarkable declaration. After stating " the vigorous measures which had been pursued, " the speech from the throne proceeds.

" You have assured me of your *firm* support in " the *prosecution* of them. Nothing, in my opinion, could be more likely to enable the well-disposed of my subjects, in that part of the " world, effectually to discourage and defeat the " designs of the factious and seditious, than the " hearty concurrence of every part of the legislature, *in maintaining the execution of the laws in every part* of my dominions.—After this no " man dreamt that a repeal under this ministry " could

"could take place." From that promise of the commons to support his majesty, and from the king's opinion concerning a hearty concurrence of every branch of the legislature *in maintaining the execution of the laws* in every part of his dominions, he argues, as if this speech of the king, and declaration of the commons were to be preclusive of all changes in the laws then subsisting; and thence he concludes that no repeal would be made under the present ministry. And who but such a dreamer has ever dreamt, that any law has been repealed, that then existed? some of the duties, for reasons already justified, were taken away by a subsequent act. But is the former repealed? is a house, that used to be inhabited by six people, without an inhabitant because one alone remains in it? But if that act be repealed, for what is this dreamer eternally contending?

It is his peculiar excellence to defeat, by a subsequent passage, what he has advanced in a former. "Five days after this speech, the public"  "part of which he is going to read, was given by Lord Hillsborough, secretary of state for the colonies. After reciting the substance of the king's speech, he goes on thus:

"I can take upon me to assure you, notwithstanding insinuations to the contrary, from men *with factious and seditious views*, that his majesty's present administration, have at no time entertained a design to propose to parliament, to lay any further taxes upon America, for the purpose of raising a revenue; and that it is at present their intention to propose, the next session of parliament, to take off the duties upon glass, paper, and colours; upon consideration of such

“ duties *having been laid contrary to the true principles of commerce.*”

“ These have always been, and *still are*, the sentiments of his majesty’s *present servants*; and by which their conduct, in *respect to America*, has been governed; and his majesty relies upon your prudence and fidelity, for such an explanation of his measures, as may tend to remove the prejudices which have been excited by the misrepresentations of those who are enemies to the peace and prosperity of Great Britain and her colonies, and to re-establish that mutual confidence and affection, upon which the glory of the empire depends.” — “Here is a canonical book of ministerial scripture, the general epistle to the Americans;” and you shall soon be convinced, that, like a true heterodox commentator, he makes it speak what it does not imply.

He first asks, “ what does Mr. Cornwall say to it?” What that gentleman said I know not; but of this I am certain, that he could have refuted the many confident assertions which this orator pronounces in immediate succession. These I will presume to answer. “ Here a repeal is *promised*, promised *without condition*, and while their authority was actually resisted.” The letter of Lord Hillsborough says, “ it is at *present* the intention of administration to *propose*, the next session of parliament, to take off the duties upon glass, paper, and colours; upon consideration of such duties having been laid contrary to the true principles of commerce.”

Do these words *promise* a repeal of an act, which only expresses the *then* intention of the ministry, to *propose* to parliament the taking away the duties on glass, paper, and colours? Can that be a *repeal*

peal of an act which leaves it in full energy, respecting the tax on tea? Can it be a repeal *without condition*; when the *condition* is, that the tax on tea shall continue? Where then is this promise, without *condition*? “*I pass by* the public promise of a peer, relative to the repeal of taxes by this house. I pass by,” says he, “the use of the king’s name in a matter of supply, that sacred and reserved right of the commons.” Is his majesty’s name applied in a matter of supply, when it is expressly said, “his majesty relies on the prudence and fidelity of the American governors, for such an explanation of measures as may tend to remove the prejudices which have been excited by the misrepresentation of those who are enemies to their country.” Where then is this *promise* of a *peer*, relative to the repeal of taxes? Where is the *king’s name* used in a matter of *supply*? But things impossible to other men, by him are easily effected. He can *bear* things that *no* longer *sound*; and, therefore, he can as readily *pass by* what *never* did exist. But truth will sting, though not reclaim, an evil conscience. He felt for those to whom these misrepresentations of the *enemies* of Great-Britain and her colonies were directed. *Vengeance* beholds the straight line of *verity*, through a medium like an ill made pane of glass, by which it is distorted from its true direction into a variety of deviations.” “I conceal,” says he, “the ridiculous figure of parliament, hurling its thunders at the gigantic rebellion of America; and then, five days after, prostrate at the feet of those assemblies they affected to despise, begging them, by the intervention of their ministerial sureties, to receive submission, and heartily promising amendment.” But where

are all these disgraceful deeds of parliament to be found? By what means can a letter from Lord Hillsborough prostrate the parliament at the feet of the American assemblies? was he ordered by parliament to write that letter? Wherein consists the ridiculous figure which parliament hath made by hurling thunders at the gigantic rebellion of America, are they not continued and encreased? But in what part of this letter are to be seen this prostration, this begging the assemblies to receive submission, and this hearty promise of amendment, in opposition to the insinuations of factious seditious men? It is indeed said, the *present* administration have not designed to propose any farther taxes on America, for *raising a revenue*; is that a submission? Is it a prostration to oppose the malice of men who intend to subvert their country's rights? Is it a prostration to take off duties which were contrary to the true principles of commerce? and that such they were, I have shewn to demonstration. Is it *begging*, to say his majesty relies on his governors for a refutation of the falsehoods which have been promulged by the enemies both of Britain and her colonies? Where then is this ridiculous figure to be found, even in the minister who wrote this letter? But although no such ignominious proceedings be therein to be discerned, you shall speedily be shewn by whom this prostration, this begging, this hearty promise of amendment were made, to the indelible disgrace of themselves; and by the impious oblation of the rights of Britain to the shrine of rebellion in America. Is not this opprobrious representation of the British parliament, something more than ridiculous in Edmund Burke, Esq?

“ *Passing*

“ Passing therefore,” says he, “ from the constitutional consideration to the mere policy, does not this letter imply, that the *idea* of taxing America, for the purpose of a revenue, is an abominable project ; when the ministry suppose none but factious men, and with seditious views, could charge them with it ?” Is it a consequence that this letter must imply, that the idea of taxing America, is an abominable project, because the ministry suppose that none but *factious* men would charge them with it ? If none but *virtuous men*, and *good subjects*, had thus accused them, it might have been supposed to be an *abominable project*. But the charges of *faction*, which are founded on the principles of *malevolence*, for interested ends, were never deemed, till now, to indicate, that the objects which were reprobated, were therefore abominable. This orator enquires into the weight of all things, as a tanner does into that of an ox’s hide, by dragging it backwards by the tail.

He continues, “ does not this letter adopt and sanctify the American distinction, of *taxing for a revenue*.” And what if it does, wherein consists the criminality ? “ Does it not formally reject all *future* taxation on that principle ?” No ! the letter expressly declares, that his majesty’s *present administration*, do not intend to propose to parliament the laying of any *further* tax for a revenue. And that it is their *present intention* to propose the next session to take off the duties on glass, &c. leaving that on tea.

Do *present* intentions *formally reject* all *future* designs of taxation for a revenue ? But he confounds all *times* and all *ideas present* and *future* ; *parts* and the *whole*, have no distinctions in his conception. “ Does it not,” he adds, “ state the

“ ministerial rejection of such principle of taxation, not as the occasional, but the constant, opinion of the king’s servants.” It states no *rejection* at all. It states only, that it was *then* the intention of the ministry to lay no *further* taxes upon the Americans; and that it was their *then* intention, to propose taking off the duties on glais, &c. Where is the *principle* of taxation rejected; when the tax on tea is continued? how do these words signify a *constant* opinion, and not an *occasional*, which expels it to be the opinion of *that time*, and on *that occasion*.

He persists, “ does it not say (I care not how consistently,) but does it not say, that their conduct, with regard to America, has been *always* governed by this policy?” That this speaker has no *care* for consistency, has been evinced beyond dispute. Otherwise, how could he have asked this question? for what is there that can prove, that the conduct of the *present* ministry, has not been governed by that policy? Were not these duties imposed by the *preceding* ministry? have not five of them been repealed by the *present*; does not this prove, to demonstration, that this conduct of not taxing for a revenue, is that which has governed the policy of the present ministers?

“ It goes further. These excellent and trusty servants of the king, justly fearful lest they themselves should have lost all credit with the world, bring out the image of their gracious sovereign from the inmost and most sacred shrine, and they pawn him, as a security for their promise. *His majesty relies on the prudence and fidelity of the commons,*” whereas it was on that of the governors, for such an explanation of his measures,

Thus,

Thus, with as much good manners as truth, he represents the ministry as a set of Popish priests, who having brought forth his majesty, as an image in a procession from the inmost shrine, turn thieves and pledge it to the commons as a set of pawn-brokers. But not a syllable of all this confident assertion is to be found in the letter. It has been already proved, that it contains nothing of all that he has asserted. Can his majesty be pledged for that which is *not* in the letter? the king relies on the governours of the provinces to explain his measures, to obviate the misrepresentations of his and the nation's enemies. Is he thereby pledged as a security for promises? promises which you are convinced have no existence? If the world does entertain the least regard for justice and for truth, the ministers will preserve their credit, and this orator become the universal contempt and outcast of every true Briton.

The conduct of lord Bottetourt in Virginia, being consentaneous with lord Hillsborough's letter, that which justifies the latter exculpates his lordship. I shall therefore only observe that this orator, so over scrupulously delicate, at the end of what he transcribes from lord Bottetourt's speech to the Virginians, has marked the subsequent words, by printing them in a different letter from the rest. "*That his majesty would rather*
part with his crown, than preserve it by deceit." The passage immediately succeeding will probably explain the reason of this distinction.

"A glorious and true character, which (since the commons suffer his ministers with impunity to answer for his ideas of taxation) they ought to make it their business to enable his majesty to preserve it in all its lustre. Let him have
 "character,

“ character, since ours is no more. Let some part
“ of the government be kept in respect.”

As no man that does, or ever did exist, has a more just claim, from invariable practice, to draw conclusions, which his premises will *not* support, I will generously allow it him in this instance. The plain meaning of the preceding words is this. Since his majesty's *ideas* of taxation are such as the ministers ought to be *punished* for carrying into execution : and since the parliament cannot punish these *iniquitous servants*, they ought to enable their *master*, the *contriver* of this *criminal* taxation, to preserve his *character* in all its lustre. If the orator chuses to accept this explanation of the preceding passage, he stands only as the most absurd of all reasoners. But I imagine from the distinctive manner in which these words are printed, “ *he* “ *would rather part with his crown, than preserve it* “ *by deceit,*” that the preceding passage was ironically intended. And this I surmise, as much from the disposition to malevolence which appears in this speech, as from the difference in the printing. For such is the irony of this speaker, it conveys no hint either of wit or humour, and always requires italics as an indication of his intention, the circumstance of malevolence excepted. If it be irony, he then escapes the imputation of absurdity in false reasoning in this instance, and only charges his sovereign with the character of *deceitful*, which is to be preserved in all its *lustre*. He will never decide this matter ; to you I leave whether it is to be imputed to his *head* or to his *heart*.

Such are the comments of this curious commentator ; and now their merit and intent are truly exposed, I will not injure your good sense. I will not even suggest that Britons can remain without conviction of his heterodoxy, and that the ge-
neral

neral epistle to the Americans is a *canonical* book of ministerial scripture. "*What does the gentleman say to that?*"

He then tells you it was the letter of lord North and of all the king's then ministers. If they have as much reason to be ashamed of that letter, as he has of his comments, they must each of them be endued with more impudence than falls to the share of one man in a million, should either of them dare to speak again in parliament. He then tells you, that "the very first news that a British parliament heard what it was to do with the duties which it had granted to the king, was by the publication of the votes of American assemblies. It was in America that your resolutions were pre-declared. It was from thence that we knew to a certainty how much exactly, and not a scruple more or less, we were to repeal. We were unworthy to be let into the secret of our own conduct."

The letter says it was the present intention of the ministry to propose, in the *next* session of parliament, to take off the duties upon glafs, &c. As the parliament was prorogued before the writing of the preceding letter to the American governours, what reason was there that the parliament should be acquainted before the prorogation, with what was intended to be proposed to them in the next session? and that a set of men can be let into the *secret* of their *own* conduct, seems to be a conception as absurd as that of the person who hung a glafs at his bed's foot to see how he *looked* when he was *fast asleep*.

"Do you after this, says he, wonder that you have no weight and no respect in the colonies. After this are you surprised that parliament is
" every

“ every day and every where losing (I feel it with
 “ sorrow, I utter it with reluctance) that reveren-
 “ tial affection which so endearing a name of au-
 “ thority ought to carry with it; that you are
 “ obeyed solely with respect to the bayonet;
 “ and that this house, the ground and pillar of
 “ freedom, is itself held up by the treacherous
 “ underpinning and clumsy buttresses of arbi-
 “ trary power.”

Is it not somewhat singular that an orator, who is supposed equally to understand every thing to which he presumes, should reprehend the conduct of ministers for not preparing the members, when the parliament was not sitting, for what they were to do when they did assemble? and that this parliament should lose their reverential affection, because they were *not* treated contrary to the dictates of this constitution, by which they are enjoined to enter the house unprepossessed and unprejudiced? if the house hath lost its endearing name of authority, to whom is it to be ascribed but to this speaker and his associates, who have filled the minds of the populace and the Americans with such resolutions to rebellion, as nothing but the bayonet can subdue? oh! but the metaphor! the beauty and preservation of the metaphor! The *house* is the *ground* on which it stands, it is the *pillar* that stands on *that* again, and is *itself* held up only by the treacherous *underpinning* clumsy *buttresses* of *arbitrary power*. And thus this house of *freedom* is held up, in this kingdom, by *that* which has constantly *overset* it in all the other nations of the earth, by the buttresses of *treachery* and *arbitrary power*.* Happy Britons,

* Bathos. chap. 5. Of the true genius for the profound, and by what it is constituted. He is to mingle bits of the most various

tons, you have nought to fear? for, according to the ideas and the words of this profound orator, your liberty can never fail! even arbitrary power props your freedom. If I could suppose him ignorant in *any thing*, from this passage I should think it must be in architecture, from whence he has taken the preceding images. The imaginations of other men have frequently transgressed the laws of nature, and combined the parts of animals that never did exist together. They have made griffins, flying-horses, centaurs, and mermaids. These the pencil may delineate, and fancy conceive the possibility of their existence. But this gentleman's genius despises such tame invention. He overleaps the bounds of *possibility*; combines such things as never can exist together; and resolutely dives into the *profund* beyond those depths to which the most daring mortal hath ever penetrated. Many of our orators have done gloriously, but Burke hath excelled them all!

He advances with equal judgement and rapidity. "If this dignity, which is to stand in the place of just policy and common sense, had been consulted, there was a time for preserving it, and for reconciling it with any concession." Of what can that *dignity* consist, which is to stand in the place of *just policy* and *common sense*? should the preservation of such a *dignity* be ever consulted? can the time have ever arrived for reconciling it with any *concession* but that of *folly*? it is the *peculiar* idea of this gentleman, respecting *dignity*,
that

various or discordant kind, as it shall best please his imagination, and contribute to his principal end, which is to glare by strong opposition of colours, and surprise by contrariety of images.

that it can be reconcileable with *bad* policy and *folly*.

But he is so benignant, he will tell you *how* and *when* this wonderful reconciliation might have been accomplished, “ *if* in the session of 1768, that session of idle terror and empty menaces, the house had, as they were often pressed to do, repealed the taxes; then their strong operations would have come justified and enforced, in case their concessions had been returned by outrages.” He has told you the preamble was a phantom, a quiddity, a thing without substance or even a name; therefore, a *nothing*. Is *that* to be repealed? He has told you *also* the act *was* repealed. And now he says, *if* the parliament *had* repealed this act, and that concession had been returned with outrage, why then their strong operations would have come justified and enforced. If this would have preserved the *dignity* of parliament, it must indeed have stood in the place of just policy and common-sense. But how could it have reconciled this *dignity* with this *concession*? Can the dignity of a state be preserved by surrendering its authority? and really the imagination, that the Americans would have returned outrages for the concession of what they required; a concession that would in fact have given up the parliamentary right of taxing them, is not a little extraordinary. If they did not, what cause could the parliament have had for enforcing? Does it not seem, as if he were convinced that these republican fanatics would *not* have accepted of any advantage that is *not* obtained by *rebellion*? and therefore, that such strong operations would have been necessary?

“ The

“ The commons,” as he declares, “ began with violence ; and before terrors could have any effect, good or bad, the ministers immediately begged pardon, and promised that repeal to the Americans, which they had refused to an easy, good-natured, complying British parliament.” As to the begging pardon, and promised repeal, those circumstances are dispatched. But how will this orator reconcile that the same parliament, which pronounced terror and menaces to the Americans, because they would not comply with the taxes, should be an easy, good-natured, complying parliament that requested this repeal ? or if they inclined to the repeal ; what could have prevented them from passing it ?

Disorder in variety we see,
And here, as all things differ, none agree.

“ The assemblies which had been publicly and avowedly dissolved, for *their* contumacy, are called together to receive the parliament’s submission.” Enough has been said on that submission. “ The ministerial directors blustered like magic tyrants here ; and then went mumping with a sore leg in America, canting, and whining, and complaining of faction, which represented them as friends to a revenue from the colonies.” Had *all* the ministerially directing mumpers, but *one* sore leg among them ? Did they take *it* by *turns* through the provinces, or how did they manage it ? but I will soon shew who were in reality the ministerially directing mumpers, and restore the *sore leg* to that *body* to which it alone belongs.

“ i hope,” says he, “ no body in this house will hereafter have the *impudence* to defend
“ American

“ American taxes in the name of ministry.” I also should have *my* hope, if any good were to be expected from this orator, that he would never more have the *impudence* to calumniate the ministry on the subject of American taxes. “ The moment they do,” says he, “ with this letter of attorney in his hand, he will tell them, in the authorized terms, they are wretches *with factious and seditious views ; enemies to the peace and prosperity of the mother country and the colonies, and subverters of the mutual affection and confidence on which the glory and safety of the British empire depend.*” Will those words, derived from the conduct of him and his confederates, authorize him to pronounce them against those who shall defend the ministry in transactions so just and defensible ? No ! he will not attempt it. He will never more produce that paper which is now so fully proved to falsify his assertions. Even he, this orator, will be too scrupulously delicate to produce, a second time, a plenary refutation of all he has compelled that paper to imply.

“ After this letter,” he adds, “ the question is no more on propriety or dignity ; they are gone already. The faith of your sovereign is pledged to the political principle. The general declaration in the letter goes to the whole of it.” The falsity of all this hath been already evinced ; it will be endless to answer a tedious repetition of the same mistakes. But mind the dictatorial spirit of this Edmund Burke, Esq; once private secretary to Lord Rockingham, to the commons of this realm, “ you must,” says he, “ therefore either abandon the scheme of taxing, or you must send the ministers tarred and feathered to America, who dared to hold out the royal faith for a re-
“ nunciation

“ nunciation of all taxes for revenue. Them you
 “ must punish, or this faith you must preserve.”
 That no such faith, for a renunciation of such taxes,
 was ever held out, has been already proved to
 demonstration. Appeal to the letter of Lord
 Hillsborough. Again be satisfied. There was a
 time when the commons of Britain would not have
 borne so dictatorial an insult, founded on the mis-
 representation and calumny of their own transacti-
 ons. In those days, had he uttered such atrocious
 terms, he would himself have been metaphorically
 tarred, and *papered* with his speech; and sent where-
 ever he pleased to go, except into that house.
 But another punishment awaits him. His *oration*
 commits self-murder. On this inquest it will be
 buried in a cross-way, and a stake driven through
 it, as a warning to all future speakers, not to rely
 on *sound* without *sense*.

“ This preservation of the royal faith,” he adds,
 “ is of more consequence than the duties on *red*
 “ *lead* or *white lead*, or on broken *glass*, or *atlas*,
 “ *ordinary*, or *demi fine*, or *blue royal*, or *bastard*,
 “ or *fool’s-cap*, which they have given up, or the
 “ *three-pence on tea*, which they retained.” And
 I will add, of more consequence than all the *fools*,
 who pretending to be speakers, are eternally
 evincing their want of intellect. But reflect, I in-
 treat you, with what propriety this opinion, of the
 preservation of the royal faith, issues from the lips
 of him, who, with his master, gave up the royal
faith which had been pledged, in the ministry of
 Mr. Grenville, to support the parliament in their
 resolves to sustain his majesty against the revolt
 of the Americans; This how shamefully they
 gave up, shall be proved when I come to examine
 the Rockingham administration.

From what motives do these eternal and self-contradictory assertions spring? Is it from inability to comprehend the plain expressions of Lord Hillsborough's letter? is it from an incapacity to draw just conclusions from his own promises? Does he imagine, that he can hold the understandings of mankind within a circle that they cannot pass, as conjurors are said to treat the devil? Is it from revenge, from desperation, from *invidiousness*? Aye, *that is the cause that makes this speech of so long breath.* "The ministry which is here shining in riches, in favour, and in power, and urging the punishment of that very offence to which this orator and his associates had been the tempters."

He continues, "If reasons, respecting simply your own commerce, which is your own convenience, were the sole grounds of the repealing of the five duties, why does Lord Hillsborough, in disclaiming in the name of the king and ministers, their ever having had an intent to tax for revenue, mention it as the means of re-establishing the confidence and affection of the colonies?" But wherein hath his lordship *disclaimed*, in the name of the king and ministers, their *ever* having had an intent to tax for revenue? his letter expressly declares the contrary; that the present administration have no design to lay any *farther* taxes upon America for a revenue. The term *farther* absolutely implies, as the fact does verify, that they were *already* laid for that end. How then will he explain, that what has *never been said* can have been *mentioned*, as the means of re-establishing the confidence of the colonies? I will presume once to answer for him. By confounding, in his usual manner, times past with times to come,

and

and things that never did exist with assertions that they have existed.

“ Is it a way of soothing *others*, says he, “ to assure them that you will take good care of “ yourself ? ” It is indeed a very mistaken way. But where does he find it ? Not in Lord Hillsborough’s letter ; for therein it is said, that his lordship “ will be content to be declared infamous, if “ he does not, to the last hour of his life, exert “ every power, in order to obtain and maintain, “ for the continent of America, that satisfaction “ which he has been authorised to promise.” Has it been violated ? Do these expressions assure the Americans, that *he* will take good care of *himself*, which promise that *care* of *them* ?

“ The medium, the only medium, for regaining the American affection and confidence, is, “ that you will take off something oppressive to “ their minds.” Have you ever heard till now of a medium *for* regaining affection ? is the *will* of taking something from their minds a *medium* ? However, to understand what his words do not express, and yet as he meant them, let me ask you if he be not a man to whom experience has *not* taught wisdom ? or could he, who advised, harangued and voted, for the repeal of the stamp act, have said, that the removal of oppression will regain confidence in America ? If what is oppressive to the minds of men be a reason for removing it, what law can then remain unabrogated ? Will not the murderer, the felon, the cheat, the impostor, and every species of villains, revolt against the parliamentary authority until the statutes, which oppress their minds, be taken off ? The blind see nothing. They know their condition, and feel their way with a stick. If this orator

would follow their example, he would not so constantly *run against the facts* which *stand* in his way.

He says, "the letter strongly enforces the idea; of easing their minds by taking away *all* taxes," and yet that letter does absolutely leave the tea tax unrepealed.

He persists, "for though the repeal of the taxes be promised on commercial principles, yet the means of counteracting *the insinuations of men with seditious and factious views*, is by a disclaimer of the intention of taxing for revenue, as a constant invariable sentiment, and rule of conduct in the government of America." There is something, to my comprehension, not a little ænigmatical in this passage. The *repeal* of the taxes is promised on commercial principles: yet the *means* of counteracting the insinuations of men with factious and seditious views, is *by* a disclaimer of the intention of taxing for revenue, as a constant invariable sentiment, and rule of conduct in the government of America. But there exists no disclaimer, as it has been already proved; and thus the *means* consist in that which has *no* existence.

"I remember," says he, "Lord North, *not in a former debate, to be fair*, (it would be disorderly to refer to it, I suppose I read it somewhere,) but the noble lord was pleased to say, that he did not conceive how it could enter into the head of man, to impose those taxes which he voted for imposing, and voted for repealing; as being taxes contrary to all the principles of commerce, laid on *British manufactures*."

Oh! what a namby pamby attempt to wit or humour do, *this to be sure, and his suppose he read it somewhere*, exhibit.

This

This he adduces as an instance of his lordship's inconsistency and self-contradiction. But I will prove that it is consistent in every part, and contemporaneous with the strictest integrity. When these taxes were laid, his lordship was not a minister. He knew *then* what he since expressed as above. His motive for voting them was the reinstating of the parliamentary authority. The taxes were estimated as a secondary consideration. He knew that every day's delay encreased the danger of annihilating the former, and therefore that it was not to be postponed. He knew the latter might be repealed on some subsequent occasion. Such were then his views. Since the time he has been minister, he has verified his opinion, by an actual repeal of those taxes on British manufactures; and he has preserved the duty on tea for the sake of sustaining the sovereign authority, which was his original and sole motive. Hence it appears, that voting at first for the imposition, and subsequently for the repeal, are neither inconsistency nor contradiction in his lordship's conduct. Painters, who wish to draw justly, practise the custom of placing their portraits before a glass, and examining them in the reflected image. By these means, a number of errors are remarked and corrected, which had otherwise escaped. It would be well judged in this orator, if he would imitate that custom; and consider his speeches in the reflexion of a better judgement than his own, before he printed them *at least*. It is true indeed the sufferings of vanity might be so grievous, by these means, that probably an orator for rebellion would be lost. But the commons would receive the vast advantage of being freed from so much senseless sound and self-contradiction.

He grows audacious. " He *dares* say the noble lord is perfectly well read, because the duty of his particular office requires he should be so, in all our revenue laws, and in the policy which is to be collected out of them." From the peculiar kind of politeness which he has shewn this nobleman, throughout his speech, I suggest this to be intended for irony. I could wish in such instances of attempting to be *humourous* or *witty*, he would follow the example of a sign painter, who could draw but one thing, which was the white rose. In consequence of his *genius* being tethered to that alone, he kept a number of signs ready painted, and then wrote under the white rose, by way of note, this is the sign of the *black dog*, or the *red lion*; as his chapman chose his sign should be. A note for the future, *this is irony*, *this is wit*, or *this is humour*, under the passages which he intends to pass for such, would be a very convenient indication to his readers. But let me seriously ask this confident speaker, whether it be not the duty of *one*, who arraigns the conduct of *others*, to be *perfectly well read* in the subject on which he speaks? hath he observed that rule in this speech?

" Now, says he, when his lordship had read this act of American revenue, and a little recovered from his astonishment, I suppose he made *one* step *retrograde* (it is but *one*, and looked at the act which stands just *before* it in the statute book." What could be the cause of his lordship's astonishment at reading an act with which he had been well acquainted, during its passing through the house, seems difficult to be conceived by a common understanding. But is there not something as truly astonishing in this orator's penetration. He has discovered that *one* step

step *retrograde* is but *one*; and that his lordship made this step *backwards*, to look at something that stood *before* his last object. He then tells you “ of the duties laid on the commodities imported “ into the isle of Man, that the two acts perfectly “ agree in all respects except one, which is, that “ the duties are a great deal higher on the things “ imported into the isle, than into the continent “ of America. And that both acts were exactly “ the same for raising revenues. He then asks, “ will the noble lord condescend to tell him why “ he repealed the taxes on your manufactures sent “ out to America, and not the taxes on the ma- “ nufactures exported to the isle of Man? the “ principle was exactly the same, the objects “ charged infinitely more extensive, the duties “ without comparison higher. Why.” He *asks* his lordship, and answers *himself*. “ Why not- “ withstanding all his childish pretexts, because “ the taxes were quickly submitted to in the isle “ of Man, and because they raised a flame in “ America, their reasons were political not com- “ mercial.”

I have already repeatedly shewn you that the principle of the American act was to re-establish the supreme legislature of this realm; and that the taxes were the means of doing it. The act relative to the isle of Man had no such motive, it was solely for raising a revenue. Your orator, however, who is constantly engaged in setting things up for the sake of overthrowing them himself, as *children* build houses with cards, is on this occasion, as is customary, kind enough to refute what his question proposes. “ It was because the taxes were *quietly* “ submitted to in the isle of Man, and because “ they raised a *flame* in America.” Did he expect

the noble lord would repeal those taxes which the Mancksmen quietly received? and when the flame which was raised, had heated the Americans to a degree of not receiving the British manufactures, whilst the duties were on them, did there not arise a just cause for repealing those duties, that the manufacturers might not be less employed in England? and thus those two things which are *exactly the same*, are *totally dissimilar*. I presume the reasons of lord North for repealing five of the American taxes were both *political* and *commercial*. That they were commercial I have sufficiently shewn, and by what magic this speaker can divide *commerce* from *policy* in this instance, *he* must explain; or *you* yourselves discover; it exceeds my comprehension.

He then returns, like a miser's ghost to his hidden treasure, and asserts "the repeal was made as
 " lord Hillsborough's letter well expresses it, to
 " acquire *the confidence and affection of the colonies,*
 " *on which the glory and safety of the British empire*
 " *depends.*" The letter expressly pronounces that the taxes were repealed on *the true principles of commerce*; and that the glory and safety of the British empire depended on effacing the misrepresentations of the *enemies* of her empire. Even this orator, in the preceding page, declares that the letter says, "*the repeal of the taxes was promised on commercial principles.*" Will he neither believe himself nor the letter? how then can he expect that the world will give credit to what he avers?

However, let it be imagined that the duties have been repealed for the reasons which he ascribes to lord Hillsborough. "That, he says, was
 " a wise and just motive surely, if ever there was
 " such. But the mischief and the dishonour is,
 " that

“ that they have not done what they had given
 “ the colonies just cause to expect, when the mi-
 “ nisters disclaimed the taxing for a revenue.”
 Hence it appears that the repeal, which he says
 was *made* on a wise and just motive, was not *made*
 at all; because the mischief and dishonour *is*,
 that the ministers have *not* done what they had
 given the colonies just reason to expect, when they
 disclaimed the idea of taxing for a revenue. And
 thus this mischief, this dishonour arose from *not*
 having *done* that which they had *done* by the repeal;
 or from disregarding the *promise* of a *disclaimer*
 which, it has been incontrovertibly proved, they
never did promise.

In fact, this orator's potatoe bed of fallacy,
 absurdity, and self-contradiction, is so extremely
 prolific: they shoot from one another in such
 amazing numbers, that no labour, no industry,
 no art, can clear the ground of their super-
 abundance.

And now for a rant of *exclamation* most over-
 scrupulously delicate, “ there is nothing simple,
 “ nothing manly, nothing ingenuous, open, de-
 “ cursive, or steady, in the proceeding with regard
 “ either to the continuance or repeal of the taxes.
 “ The whole has an air of littleness and fraud.”
 It is a painful task so constantly to return to the
 refuting of what has been already so repeatedly
 disproved. Yet such is the confidence of this
 speaker and his associates, that if a single circum-
 stance, although it be exactly similar to what has
 been already refuted, be left unanswered, they
 will unanimously pronounce, it is unanswerable. I
 therefore intreat your patience in the prolixity of
 this reply. And although I may with safety refer
 you to the narrative already given of ministerial
 conduct

conduct in this affair, yet to preclude every means of his eluding a defeat, I will examine this explosion of verbosity.

The simpleness of every undertaking consists in its being compounded of as few objects as possible. In this instance, it consists of two alone; those of restoring the supreme authority to exertion and vigour in America, and of imposing a tax as the means of obtaining that end. Thus the *end* and the *means* constitute but *two*. Can he conceive an undertaking in which there are neither means nor object? is he so skilled in any art, that he can so simplify *two* things as to make them less than *two*? where then is the want of its being *simple*. Wherein consists the defect of manliness? the act indeed imposed taxes, on several commodities, in a former administration, which lord North then disliked. They were repealed, since he was minister, for commercial reasons. But the duty on tea does still preserve that act in as much energy as before: and the means which are now employing evince that it is supported by manliness. But that Edmund Burke, who advised, harangued, and voted for the pusillanimous retreat of his master before rebellion, without risking an engagement, should charge the ministry with unmanliness, is an act of confidence not easily to be equalled. And as nonsense can never be more justly applied than to him, it may be said, *none but himself can be his parallel*.

Return to lord Hillsborough's letter, you will there be convinced that nothing can be more ingenuous, open, decisive, or steady, in the proceeding, with regard either to the continuance or the repeal of the taxes. You are therein told that the five duties are only intended to be repealed; that it was the present intention of the minister
to

to lay no more taxes for a revenue; that his lordship pledged his honour for the truth of these things. All these particulars have been most religiously observed. From whence then does this charge arise, of disingenuous concealment, indecision, versatility, with regard either to the continuance or repeal of the taxes? from the dictates of a *heart*, which wants nothing but the ability of a *head* to spread destruction on the constitution of this country. What a felicity it is, that the powers of men are inadequate to their wills on such occasions! but the most extravagant instance of this rant is, his branding the ministry, and even the parliament with having acted with *littleness* and *fraud*. And this ignominy, which, it seems, the liberty of speech allows to be *pronounced* in parliament, he has *published* to the world. It is an act as becoming *him* to do, as for *them* to suffer.

He perseveres, "the article of tea is flurred over in the circular letter as it were by accident.—Nothing is said of a resolution either to keep that tax, or to give it up. There is no fair dealing in any part of the transaction." In what does it appear that the article of tea was flurred over as by accident? is not the positive mention of the other five taxes being to be repealed, without speaking of that on tea, as expressive, and as clear, that it was to be continued, as if it had been attended with a thousand asseverations? Was it not in that sense understood by the Americans? because he has told you that *one* step is but *one*, does he imagine it necessary to declare a resolution, that what is seen to be absolutely *reserved*, is *not* to be *given away*? if returning from a journey, he orders his servant to take off his boots, does he think it necessary to tell him he must
leave

leave on his stockings? I will now ask him where is *his fair dealing in any part of this transaction.*

Like a fox that constantly returns to the same cover from which he has been frequently hunted, that by leading the hounds through brakes and briars, and by earthing at last, hath eluded the pursuit of the huntsmen; so this orator returning to the same subject, expects by leading you through the brambles of absurdity and self-contradiction; and by diving into the vast profound, eternally to escape. The subsequent passage is an instance of his design. "If you mean," says he, "to follow your true motives and your public faith, give up your tax on tea for raising a revenue, the principle of which has, in effect, been disclaimed in your name, and which produces you no advantage; no, not a penny. Or if you choose to go on with a poor pretence, instead of a solid reason; and will still adhere to your *cant* of commerce; you have ten thousand times more strong commercial reasons for giving up this duty on tea; than for abandoning the five others, that you have already renounced."

This passage is addressed to the commons. He presumes to bid them follow their *true motives* and their public *faith*, to give up the tax on tea, the principle of which has been disclaimed in their name. This alludes to lord Hillsborough's letter, in which not a syllable is said of the commons, but that the ministry intend to *propose* to parliament to take off the tax. The faith of parliament has never been either mentioned or alluded to in that letter; and as to the disclaimer, that falsity hath been sufficiently exploded. However, in plain English, it is. If you choose to go on with your poor pretence, you are a pack of fellows
without

without solid reason, and *can'ters* on commerce. I shall leave the commons to answer, or to acquiesce in these charges as they please. As to the ten thousand times stronger commercial reasons for giving up the duty on tea, than the others, I will give no farther answer.

“ The American consumption of tea, is annually, I believe, worth 300,000*l.* at the least farthing. If you urge the American violence as a justification of your perseverance in enforcing this tax, you know that you can never answer this plain question: Why did you repeal the others given in the same act, whilst the very same violence subsisted?” But where is this violence urged as a justification of persevering to enforce this tax? Establish the *if* and you shall have the *answer*. But without that the truth shall be told you. The taxes were not repealed to appease the violence, but for commercial reasons. The tea tax was continued, because that violence should not be complied with, but subdued. “ But,” says he, “ you did not find that violence cease upon that concession.” The ministry did never expect it. They had been long convinced, by his and his ministers *concession*, that their outrage would be rather encreased: and therefore they prepared to defeat that violence by other means than concessions. But let me give you his answer: “ No. “ Because the concession was far short of answering the principle which Lord Hillsborough had abjured, or even the pretence on which the repeal of the other taxes was announced.” What principle is it that his lordship hath abjured? Not the principle of re-establishing the supreme authority over the Americans, because the tax is left to sustain its right. Not that of imposing no further

taxes

taxes on America, because that is also preserved. But what is the plain English of *satisfying a principle*? The pretence, as he calls it, the true commercial principle, on which the repeal of the other taxes was announced, was certainly carried into execution. But will not every concession be short of satisfying the Americans, that does not yield a plenary renunciation of the British sovereignty to the demands of rebellion? Is that the satisfaction which he urges to be granted?

He continues attempting to reason, "and because, " by enabling the East-India company to open a " shop for defeating the American resolution not to " pay that specific tax, you manifestly shewed a " hankering after the principle of the act, which " you formerly had renounced."

What sort of shop it was the East-India company were enabled to open; and how effectually it defeated the American resolution, of not paying the tax; the breaking open the ships which carried the tea to the colonies, the committing felony, and throwing the tea into the rivers, sufficiently explain. But I conceive these shops can not be properly said to be for defeating, although they may for establishing the resolution of *not* paying the tax. That this attempt, to enable the company, shewed something more than a hankering after the principle of the act, the support of the parliamentary authority, I readily agree. But I absolutely deny, because it has been irrefragably proved, that this principle was ever renounced.

" Whatever road you take," says he, " tends " to a compliance with this motion. It opens to " you at the end of every vista. Your commerce, " your policy, your promises, your reasons, your " pretences, your consistency, your inconsistency — " all

“ all jointly oblige you to this repeal.” Such being the case, that all things, and even those that were never conjoined in the promotion of the same event till this hour, *Consistency* with *inconsistency*, are united to oblige the ministry to repeal this act, why, in the name of nonsense, has this orator bestowed so much lung-labour in persuading them to *accomplish* that which they are *necessitated* to perform? As when an alarm is given at the door of a dove-house, the pigeons hurry out in confusion at the top of it, and leave their nests and young to whatever may arrive: so in any commotion from within, the words of this orator press in tumult through his mouth, and leave the half-hatched and unfledged ideas never to attain maturity.

Every step he takes he advances in his confidence of assertion. “ It still sticks in our throats, “ if we go so far, the Americans will go farther. “ We do not know that.” By this he must certainly mean they do *not* know whether it *sticks in their throats* or not. For it has been *long known*, that they have already gone *farther on concession*. “ However,” he says, “ the house ought from experience rather presume the contrary.” I will appeal to this experience for a refutation of what he says. When the duty on molasses was ordered to be strictly collected, in Mr. Grenville’s ministry, and other things were enacted, displeasing to the Americans, they made no opposition to the legislative authority of this realm. They acquiesced therewith, and petitioned parliament for redress. When the stamp act was opposed in parliament, and that split-devil distinction of the legislature, into the right of laying external, and not internal, taxes on the colonies was engendered, this opinion was
greedily

greedily adopted by the Americans. It was fostered by the repeal of the stamp act. And then the persuasion prevailed among them, that the legislature of Britain had no right to tax them, either externally or internally. In consequence of this progression in the principles of rebellion, when the external duties were laid on goods imported into America, they openly refused to obey the legislative authority; advanced to felony; and are now in actual rebellion. As all these were the consequences of *concession*, ought not the parliament to conclude, from experience, that a *farther concession* will create still greater demands, until there be nothing left to be conceded?

“ Can they do more, or can they do worse, if the Commons yield this point?” he asks. He answers, “ he thinks this concession will rather fix a turnpike to prevent their farther progress.” The question, singular as it is, is a mere nothing in comparison with the answer. It is indeed a singular conception, that men who can do nothing more, nor worse, should be indulged with any thing without correction. But let me come to the turnpike. The thing which is to set up and fix this turnpike, to prevent their farther progress, is the *taking down* of an act of parliament, that will not let them go through *without* paying. Now, by what genius, by what art, this cunning-man can make the *taking down* of a law, that stops them *until they pay*, and thereby leaving the passage absolutely free, can be *like fixing a turnpike to prevent* their farther progress, is a *similitude* in which I can see *no* likeness. However, it is not without a precedent equally pre-eminent. When May Drummon, in one of *her* holdings forth, to a quaking congregation, was speaking of the world, she told them,

them, it was as *round* — as *round* — as a horse's head. Such is the amazing resemblance between the intellectual faculties of these two celebrated *speakers*.

"It is impossible," he says, "to answer for bodies of men." Or single ones either, were they all like this orator. "But he is sure the natural effect of fidelity, clemency, kindness in governors, is peace, good-will, order, and esteem, on the part of the governed." And so am I too; but not towards rebels. Has he not been taught the contrary by the repeal of the stamp act? He seems not to distinguish between the effects of concession to dutiful and to rebellious subjects. The history of Charles the first irrefragably evinces, that every concession of that king to the progenitors of these men, who were then rebels, as their descendants now are, inflamed their impudence; increased their outrages; and aggravated their demands; until by consecutive yieldings to all they asked, that sovereign was murdered; the people robbed, of their rights of election by their representatives voting themselves an *eternal* parliament; and the constitution fundamentally subverted. Every concession *then*, as in the case of the Rockingham concession *since*, strengthened their persuasion that *fear* had been the motive to it; that the same dastardly spirit would constantly give way before their most atrocious demands; and that nothing would be denied. Is it ignorance in the nature of humankind? Is it a premeditated design to subvert the state, rather than yield to reason? or is it *self-interest*, which, counteracting all the salutary proceedings of the ministry, and every virtue of highest estimation among mankind that urges

H

this

this man to involve this nation in ruin, rather than not to avert his own.

“ And now,” says he, “ Mr. Cornwall having spoken what he thought necessary upon the narrow part of the subject, I have given him, I hope, a satisfactory answer.” If his hope of a joyful resurrection; be not more *sure* and *certain*, than this of having satisfied Mr. Cornwall; or any man of common-sense, he cannot do better than follow the attorney’s example, in a vision of Don Quivodo, and prepare himself with a speech, in order to plead a demurrer on the day of judgment.

He continues, “ Mr. Cornwall next presses him by a variety of *direct* challenges, and *oblique* reflexions, to say something on the historical part.” This Mr. Cornwall is a dreadful adversary, he attacks him *alone* in *front* and *flank*. You shall see how he defends himself. On this account “ he will open himself fully on that important and delicate subject : not for the sake of telling Mr. Speaker a long story, which he knows Mr. Speaker is not particularly fond of, but for the sake of the weighty *instructions* that he *flatters* himself will necessarily result from it.”

You cannot have forgotten, that in his exordium he *exclaims*, “ that for *nine long years*, session after session, the Commons had been lashed round and round a miserable circle, till their heads turned giddy, and their stomachs turned up the arguments they had received.” And now he enters into a continuance of that long nine years lashing, in a *long* story, for the sake of the weighty *instructions* the house may receive. And this he undertakes, although, he had assured you in
that

that exordium, that " invention was exhausted ; reason fatigued ; and experience had given judgement." Is it, therefore, to be admired, that neither Mr. Speaker nor the members are fond of such long and sickening stories ?

It seems indeed to be no common act of *self-adulation*, in Mr. Burke, to imagine, after all the preceding time and circumstances, that *he* alone should conceive that his invention was not exhausted, nor his reason fatigued. For if he did not secretly except himself, by what means could he have found *instructions* in this instance ? The plain meaning of all this is, you the Commons of Great Britain, are five hundred and fifty-seven such thick-skulled rascals, that after being lashed for nine long years, till your inventions were exhausted, and your reasons fatigued, if you had any, you remain so egregiously ignorant of this important subject, that I, who alone understand it, am obliged to tell you a long story for the sake of *instructing* you in that which is necessary for you to know. In what a miserable situation must the present parliament have been, had not Mr. Burke been re-elected a representative ! From whom could they have had one word of weighty instruction, since he must have run away with all the understanding of the house. Thus an *over-scrupulous delicacy* of assuming superior knowledge, like the light in the glow-worm's tail, shines in this orator, and discovers itself the more evidently by means of that impervious obscurity which surrounds him in the senate. He is the pillar of smoke by day, and of fire by night, that guides them through the wilderness of America.

However, he promises, " it shall not be longer, " if he can help it, than so serious a matter requires." And then, with a view to keep his word and *shorten* his story, he asks permission " to lead the Commons *very far back*, back to the " act of navigation, the corner stone of the policy of this country, with regard to the colonies."

" That policy," he continues, " was from the " beginning purely commercial, and the commercial system was wholly restrictive. It was " the system of a monopoly. No trade was let " loose from that constraint, but merely to enable " the colonists to dispose of what in the course of " your trade you could not take; or to enable " them to dispose of such articles as we forced upon them, and for which, without some degree " of liberty, they could not pay.—This principle of commercial monopoly, runs through no " less than twenty-nine acts of parliament, from " the year 1666, to the unfortunate period of " 1764." The nature and effects of this system of a monopoly shall be explained to you in a subsequent part of this answer.

" In all those acts," he adds, " the system of " commerce is established as that from whence " alone you propose to make the colonists contribute" (he means directly, and by the operation of the superintending legislative power) " to the " strength of the empire. He *ventures* to say, " that during that whole period, a parliamentary " revenue from thence was never *once* in contemplation." I should indeed have entertained a less doubt, that this accurate speaker does really know all that was in *contemplation*, during that period and on that subject, in the heads of other men, if

if he had shewn himself to be better acquainted with that which hath *passed* in his *own*. However, he hath wonderful gifts from nature. And as he *bears* what has done *sounding*, why may he not have perceived all that hath passed sixty years before he was born? whatever may be your conclusion on that head, you will not deny him the merit of being an *adventurer*.

“ Accordingly, says he, in all the number of laws passed, with regard to the plantations, the words which distinguish revenue laws specifically as such, were, he thinks, premeditatedly avoided.” He allows that “ a form of words certainly does not alter the nature of the law, nor abridge the power of the law-giver. He states these facts to shew, not what was the parliamentary right, but what has been the settled policy. Our revenue laws have *usually* a title purporting their being *grants*; and the words *give and grant*, *usually* precede the enacting parts.” From this premise, which expresses a *custom* to be *usual*, and therefore does consequently imply that it was *sometimes observed*, and at *others not*, he draws an *absolute* conclusion, that the terms *give and grant* being omitted in the acts, relative to America, render them not laws for a revenue, an induction which nothing but an *universal practice*, of inserting the preceding words into all our revenue laws, can warrant. For as the *omission* of them is *usual*, as well as the *insertion*, that omission affords a precedent for their being as legally to be left out, as the other to be inserted in all such statutes. This is the precedent which the parliament observed in the revenue acts relative to America. And therefore when “ duties were imposed on the colonists in acts of king Charles the second, and in acts

of William, though no one title of giving *an aid to his majesty*, or any other of the usual titles to revenue acts, was to be found in any of them till 1764." It is evident they were nevertheless *revenue laws*, according to *usual* custom.

He then adds, "nor were the words *give and grant*, in any preamble, until the 6th of George the second, 1773." And hence it results, that although he *thought* the words *give and grant* were *premeditatedly left out* of the American acts for 104 years, he *knew* them *premeditatedly to be put in* for 44 of that time. Hence it is evident also, that these words "which distinguish revenue laws specifically as such, were no innovation in 1764, because they had been thus applied more than thirty years before that time. The means, by which he attempts to evade the contradiction which that act gives to his preceding assertion, are not less curious than the assertion itself. "However," says he, "the title of this act of George the second, notwithstanding the words of donation, considers it merely as a regulation of trade, *an act for the better securing the trade of his majesty's sugar colonies in America.*" And thus according to this orator's mode of arguing, the mention of the word *trade*, for which *money* is given by parliament, makes it no *donation*. And for the same reason, if a man christens his son by the name of *Mary* his *sex* is changed. Would an act, raising money for the better security of the linnen *trade* of his majesty's kingdom of Ireland, followed by the words *give and grant*, be no donation, because it was to regulate trade?

To the preceding he adds, "the act of George the second was made on a compromise of all, and at the express desire of a part of the colonies

“ Ionies themselves. It was therefore, in some
 “ measure, with their consent ; and having a title
 “ directly purporting only a *commercial regulation*,
 “ and being in truth nothing more, the words
 “ were passed by, at a time when no jealousy was
 “ entertained, and things were little scrutini-
 “ zed.” You shall soon discern, how ridiculously
 he wriggles, to get out of an uneasy situation ;
 like a bad horseman with a galled backside, and
 yet can find no remission of his soreness.

What credit is to be given to this account of a
 compromise of all the colonies will be evident
 from governour Bernard’s letter, dated in 1763,
 which this speaker cites, in confirmation of what
 he hath said. “ At the time of making the mo-
 “ lasses act, now thirty years ago, it was asserted
 “ by the West Indians, that as the British West
 “ Indian plantations were capable of taking off all
 “ the produce of America, the sending such pro-
 “ duce to foreign plantations ought to be dis-
 “ couraged. To this the North Americans then
 “ answered, by denying (I believe with greater
 “ truth) that the British plantations were incapable
 “ of taking off all the produce of North Ame-
 “ rica fit for the West India markets. The West
 “ Indians prevailed, and a duty of 50 per cent.
 “ was laid by parliament on all molasses imported
 “ from islands not belonging to Great-Britain.”

Was this act made, in consequence of a *com-
 promise*, which by that *excessive* duty on molasses,
 not of the produce of the British islands, would
 have ruined the North American trade, had it not
 been evaded by contraband ? would the Americans,
 on so interesting an occasion, have paid no attention
 to the *new words* of *giving and granting*, had these
 terms been exceptionable ; or had any doubt been

entertained of the right of the British legislature, to lay what taxes they thought proper on the colonies? do not facts eternally arise to confute this orator in all his assertions? and when he quotes the preceding letter of governor Bernard, who gives his opinion, not as the orator cites it, "that it *was* an act of *prohibition* not of revenue," but that he *believes* it was originally designed for a prohibition. But suppose it were, in what sense does that circumstance alter the meaning of the terms, *give and grant*, or answer the intention of this orator, when he asserts they were *premeditatedly* avoided for more than a century?

"This," says he, "is certainly true, that no act avowedly for the purpose of revenue, and with the ordinary title and recital, *taken together*, is found in the statute book until the year he hath mentioned, that is in the year 1764." What a futile and obvious evasion of the reality of things is here intended! the *title* and *recital* are not in the *same* act. But are they not separately in distinct acts? if they are not, will not his own opinion, in one place, counterbalance it in another? "that a *form of words* does not alter the nature of the law, nor abridge the power of the law-giver." To what intent then is all this *parlaver* about the form of words so *lastingly* and so *nauseatingly* urged?

"The scheme of a colony revenue, by British authority, appeared therefore to the Americans in the light of a great innovation; the words of governor Bernard's ninth letter, written in November 1765, states this idea very strongly. It must, says he, have been supposed, *such an innovation as a parliamentary taxation*, would cause a great alarm, and meet with much *op-*
position,"

“ *position*, in most parts of America ; it was *quite*
 “ *new* to the people, and had no *visible bounds* set
 “ to it. After stating the weakness of government
 “ there, he says, was this a time to introduce *so*
 “ *great a novelty*, as a parliamentary inland tax-
 “ ation in America ? whatever the right might
 “ have been, this mode of using it was absolutely
 “ new in policy and practice.”

If this orator be possessed of any degree of merit, it lies in its being undiscoverable, whether his assertions originate from sheer ignorance, intended falacy, or premeditated mischief. By the antecedent quotation of governor Bernard's letter, it is manifest he designed to create a persuasion in you, that it related solely to the act passed in 1764, relative to the preceding act of George the second, which laid so vast a duty on molasses imported from other islands than the British. It is this act, which he would induce you to believe, was that which was considered as an innovation of a *parliamentary taxation*, that would cause an *alarm* ; meet with much *opposition* ; be *quite new* to the people ; and which had no *visible bounds* set to it. Yet such is the fact, that all the preceding circumstances have no more relation to the act of 1764, than to the first chapter of the Alcoran. On the passing of that act, they never disputed the legislative authority. They thought of no innovation, and made no opposition to it. On the contrary, in the 5th letter of governor Bernard, the people of the Massachusetts petitioned parliament for redress from that duty, and from several other things contained in that act. And by that application, it was fully evinced, that they acknowledged the authority by which that act was made. Every syllable, that this orator hath thus applied to the act of 1764, stands in governor

Ber-

Bernard's letter, which he quotes, expressive of the stamp-act only of 1765, the mention of which he conceals. And thus he insidiously represents the former, "as the *great novelty of a parliamentary external taxation in America*," although all the antecedent circumstances are relative to an *internal* taxation on paper. And then he says, "what-
 " ever the right might have been, this mode of
 " using it was absolutely new in policy and prac-
 " tice;" although it were as old in both as the reign of Charles the second, which he himself allows. If this be the result of ignorance, can he for the future be considered as a man of common understanding? if it be the effect of an intended falacy, at what rate shall his integrity be estimated? if it be the consequence of premeditated mischief, what will you think of his heart? if a combination of them all, what—I will not ask the question. "He now thinks the commercial restraint is full
 " as hard a law for the Americans to live under,
 " as that for the American revenue, if uncompensated he thinks it to be a condition of as
 " egregious servitude as men can be subject to.
 " But America bore it from the fundamental act
 " of navigation until 1764." To which I will add until 1765. And so she would have done to this hour, if the enemies of this kingdom had not incensed the colonists to rebellion.

But not contented with assertions, he will give you his reasons, and thus overset on the other side what might have stood, for a short time, had he been less busy in propping it. "Why?" his answer is, "because men do bear the inevitable constitution
 " of their original nature with all its infirmities." And what infirmities either originally natural, or adventitious do men *not* bear, which are *inevitable*? what a precious circumlocution of no mean-
 ing

ing, do the preceding words exhibit. The inference however is admirable. Because those men who have, by nature, hump-backs, bandy-legs, *patriotic* eyes, or other infirmities of their *bodily constitutions*, which they cannot avoid, do bear them; the Americans bore the navigation act, which was a *bump* in their political constitution, until 1764, when they attempted to be *freed* from what was *inevitably* to *bold* them. This if uncompensated, he thinks as rigorous a servitude as men can be subject to. God send us all, say I, erect postures, straight limbs, and eyes unlike the immaculate Lord Mayor, or the lord have mercy on us! for otherwise, being thus prepared in body, our *minds* will inevitably bear slavery of course. Paddy Blake's echo would have given a more rational answer to that *why*; for when any one cried aloud *how do you do captain Blake*, the echo very sensibly answered for the captain, *pretty well I thank you*. From the preceding passage, it appears, that the navigation act, which a few pages before "was the corner stone of our policy, with regard to the colonies," is now become an infirmity in that very policy.

After a short *exclamation* on the act of navigation, which, with its *infirmities*, "grew with their growth, and *strengthened* with their *strength*," he talks of their monopolist, his riches, his immense capital, which primarily employed for his own benefit, enriched the others, and was a hot-bed to them; he adds; "nothing in the history of mankind is like their progress. For his part, he never casts an eye on their flourishing commerce," under a monopoly, "their cultivated commodious life," under a state of slavery. "But they seem to him rather antient nation
tion

“ tions grown to perfection through a long series
 “ of fortunate events, and a train of successful in-
 “ dustry, accumulating wealth in many centuries,
 “ than the colonies of yesterday; than a set of
 “ miserable outcasts, a few years ago, not so much
 “ sent as thrown out on the bleak and barren shore
 “ of a desolate wilderness, three thousand miles
 “ from all civilized intercourse.”

I shall withhold my remarks on the happy state of the Americans for a few minutes. In the mean while, I readily agree with this orator, that such a set of *miserable outcasts*, part rebels, part felons, were thrown out from hence, and *into* the Massachusetts and Virginia; that the bleakest and most barren shore of the most desolate wilderness upon earth, would have been too good and too hospitable a retreat for them. “All this,” he says, “was done by England, whilst England pursued trade and forgot revenue.” Since the revolution at least, I think that *revenue* has not been forgotten, in this kingdom. And as England has created the commerce, enriched the colonists, and made them so happy, does it not seem reasonable that a revenue should now be thought on for America? perhaps the subsequent passage of your orator may justify such a proceeding. “He says, we not only acquired commerce, but actually created the very objects of trade in America, and by that creation raised the trade of this nation at least four-fold. America had the compensation of your capital, which made her bear her servitude.” Hence it appears, that no mother was ever more indulgent to her progeny, than Britannia to her colonies. It *created* the objects of their commerce; it supported them with her capital; and if the trade of this kingdom was encreased four-fold, by these means, was it not owing to herself; and
 you

you have already seen from the words of this orator, how rapidly the Americans advanced to a cultivated and commodious life, and attained a degree of accumulated wealth, to which antient nations arrived but through a long series of fortunate events, and a train of successful industry. If this unexampled progress to ease and happiness, whilst you have been oppressed by debts, and burthened with taxes, be a state of *servitude*, make me a *slave* ! give me the *effects* ! let others find felicity in the *sound* of liberty.

He persists " she had another compensation " which you are now going to take from her. " She had, except the commercial restraint, every " characteristic mark of a free people in all her " external and internal concerns. She had the " image of the British constitution. She had the " substance. She was taxed by her own representatives. She chose most of her own magistrates. She paid them all. She had in effect " the sole disposal of her own internal government." All these she would have still preserved, had she obeyed the law which imposed the duties on the importation of the commodities already mentioned. All these circumstances are correlative with those of all the cities and towns corporate in England. They are charteral rights, subordinate to the supreme legislative authority." And do these rights take from the constituents, of the respective corporations, any the minutest part, of their liberty, because they are still obedient to the laws of parliament ? By what change in the nature of things can the same cause reduce the colonists to *servitude*, which has been constantly deemed a productive of *freedom* in England ? America still possesses the same image, the same substance

substance of the British constitution, which you enjoy. And on what account rebellion and ingratitude should be presented with *more*, is a question not easily to be discerned by loyal subjects.

His observations are equal to all the other exertions of his intellect. He tells you "this *whole* " state, of commercial *servitude*, and civil *liberty*, " taken together, is certainly not *perfect freedom*." Which is as shrewd a remark as that a magpye being part *white* and part *black*, taken together is not *all white*. " But, he adds, " comparing it " with the ordinary circumstances of human nature, it was a happy and a liberal condition." Such is the conclusion of his account of American *servitude*; exactly like the *freedom* of Britons, a *happy* and a *liberal* condition. A condition which this orator, and his adherents, first taught these Americans the insolence to question, the hardness to despise, and the madness to forfeit by rebellion. These are the blessings for which the colonists are obliged to those, who wearing the patriotic mask of saving them, have at once involved their country and her colonies in this unnatural contention.

" He knows," he tells you, " that great, and " not unsuccessful, pains have been taken to inflame our minds, by an outcry, in this house " and out of it, that in America the act of navigation neither is, nor never was obeyed. But " as an answer to this," he affirms, " its authority " never was disputed." If he *disobeyed* the ten commands, does he imagine, that his not *disputing* the *authority* which promulged them, will be taken as a proof of his *obedience* to what they injoin? that would be an admirable and an easy method of attoning for sins. In fact, he considers *his* affirmation as an *answer* to his *own* position.

However,

However, to be always consistent with himself, in the subsequent words he says, " that the authority which was *never* disputed, was no where disputed for any *length* of time, and on the whole that it was well observed." Thus it turns out, that what was *never disputed*, was nevertheless *disputed*, but not *long*. How well it was observed, his succeeding words will convince you. " Whenever the act pressed hard, many of the individuals indeed *evaded* it. These scattered individuals, never denied the law, and never obeyed it." This is certainly an excellent proof of laws being *well* obeyed, because many individuals *evaded* it. Is it not an admirable and judicious assertion. " That the breach of the laws is nothing." What a number of individuals have been innocently executed at Tyburn for committing Mr. Burke's *nothing* ! Is it not a pity that he is not minister, to repeal those cruel acts which send such a multiplicity of guiltless men to death, for doing *nothing* at all ? To the foregoing he adds, that " these scattered individuals never obeyed the law, and never denied it." And thus by way of disproof of what had been said in the house, that the navigation act was *never obeyed*, he asserts that its *authority* was *never disputed*, although it was *sometimes* disputed : and that the law was *well* obeyed upon the whole, although it was *disobeyed* by those on whom it pressed hard. And those you shall presently see were the whole commercial subjects of America. Thus, by way of apology for his American favourites, he allows that they never disputed the legislative authority which enacted that law, but refused to comply with it ; that is, they were not *mistaken* in their judgments, but *rogues* by *inclination*, in which
they

they persist to this hour. The whole of this passage is a piece of logical induction, so exquisitely curious and unprecedented, that it cannot but establish his reputation as a reasoner beyond all possibility of demolition. But such is the peculiarity of his nature, he cannot be satisfied until he has adduced every proof which can refute what he himself has advanced. Accordingly, he says, the “laws were not *better obeyed* in this kingdom, from “Portland Frith to the isle of Wight,” which affords a fair inference, undoubtedly, that they *were* obeyed in America. And that the other parts of this kingdom are not smugglers. Altho’ he has so happily established his assertion by arguments, he is nevertheless resolved to support it by authority. “I take it for granted,” says he, “that the authority of governor Bernard, in this point, is indisputable. Speaking of these laws, as they “regarded that part of America, now in so unhappy a condition, he says, *I believe they are no “where better supported than in this province. I do “not pretend it is entirely free from a breach of these “laws; but that such a breach, if discovered, is “justly punished.*” But is this a proof that they are duly obeyed, because the *breach* of them is justly punished if it be discovered?

But facts speak for themselves. In the third letter of the same governor, and on the same subject, he says, “the publication of orders for the “strict execution of the molasses act has caused “a greater alarm than the taking Fort William “Henry did in the year 1757. The merchants “say, there is an end of the trade of this province; that it is sacrificed to the West-Indian “planters; petitions from the trading towns have “been presented to the general court; and a large “committee

“ committee of both houses is sitting every day
 “ to prepare instructions to their agents.” If
 these laws were well obeyed, and none but *scattered*
individuals evaded them, whence did this *universal* alarm arise, on their being *obliged* to pay the
 duty? on what account did *all* the merchants pronounce the *trade* of that province to be at an end;
 if, antecedent to that time, the law and the payment of the duties had not been universally eluded?
 Thus, in calling the evidence of governor Bernard to his aid; your Orator has absolutely confirmed the truth of that which he set out to disprove. “That in America the Act of Navigation
 “ neither is, nor ever was obeyed.”

He proceeds. “ Whether you were right or
 “ wrong in establishing the colonies on the principles of commercial monopoly, rather than on
 “ that of revenue, is, at this day, a problem of mere speculation. You cannot have both by the
 “ same authority. To join together the restraints
 “ of an universal internal and external monopoly, with an universal internal and external taxation,
 “ is an unnatural union; perfect uncompensated slavery. You have long since decided for
 “ yourself and them; and you and they have
 “ prospered exceedingly under that decision.”

With respect to the speculative problem I have nothing to say. But in order to place his assertion, that we cannot have what he denominates a commercial monopoly, and a revenue by the same authority, it is expedient that this monopoly be explained to you. To this intent it seems necessary to lay before you a succinct account of the American trade. It shall be first considered relative to the exportation from the colonies. All the islands belonging to Great Britain, in the West-Indies,

are open to the sale of whatever the American colonies do produce; and America, south of Florida, to that of their rice. 2. They trade to the Madeira and Azores islands with their productions, from whence they carry back the wines of those countries. 3. All the parts of Europe, south of Cape Finistère, are open to them for fish, lumber, rice, grain, flour, and sugars of foreign growth. 4. To the north of that cape, their commerce is prohibited, without first arriving in some port of Great Britain. Tobacco, indico, furs, hemp, silk, turpentine, masts, yards, &c. are to be landed in Great Britain only. Can this be deemed an universal monopoly respecting this kingdom? But the word monopoly implies no kind of injustice, if the effects of it be not injurious to those whom it excludes. Let me examine whether the preceding injunctions be to the benefit or disadvantage of the colonists. The colonies in America, on a medium, are not less than three thousand miles from Britain; and from some of the ports on the northern and southern shores of the European continent, they are much further. In all commercial intercourse, nothing is more necessary and advantageous, than the means of speedily transmitting intelligence from one place to another. Letters from Britain, or from any of the preceding ports, cannot be conveyed to America, and answers received in less than three months, on a medium. And this inevitable circumstance is attended with such manifest inconveniencies, that it may be estimated at an almost impracticability of correspondence. The consequences which must arise from this delay and uncertainty, are sometimes crowded markets, which reduce the prices of their commodities; at others, the loss of profit by being

uninformed

uninformed of the proper times of sending them. Besides other incidents, which are sufficiently obvious to mercantile men. In such cases, and at such distances, an *interport* for lodging the American productions becomes absolutely necessary. And if the laws did not require the commodities, above-mentioned, to be landed and lodged in England, the interest of the colonists would have obliged them to fix on such an intermediate place. The merchants of England are factors for the colonists, to whom their productions are consigned. These have a quick and certain correspondence with the merchants of other European nations. They are timely acquainted with the rise and fall of their prices ; can sell them or not, according to their intelligence and judgement. The interests of the colonists and of their factors are the same. The height of the price is the benefit of both ; of the former in the sale, and of the latter in his *per cents*. And as the duties, either paid, or for which bonds have been given, are, on export, either repaid or remitted; the expences which arise from commissions are more than compensated by a degree of profit, which could not be otherwise obtained. Such being the state of that which, as I suppose, your orator calls an external monopoly, what injury is hereby done to the Americans? are not you the inhabitants of this kingdom in a worse situation? are there not many of your productions, the export of which is absolutely interdicted? such as sheep, wool, wool-fells, yarn of wool, fuller's earth, and others; but is this to be deemed a monopoly, because the national welfare requires that they shall not be sold to others?

With respect to the monopoly of internal commerce, I suppose it may mean, a pro-

hibition of one colony from sending their manufactured hats and a few other things into the others; and that of permitting none but British manufactures, or such merchandize as hath been landed in Britain, provisions from Ireland excepted, to be imported into America. But when it is considered that, of all the manufactures and commodities produced in this kingdom, which pay either excise or duty, and most others imported into it, such as Portugal and Spanish wines, East-India and other goods, the duties are drawn back on exportation to America; that premiums are given to encourage them to the producing of a variety of commodities, which they otherwise would not attempt, and by these means to get your money; and bounties on some of our exported merchandize, which reduces the prices below what you pay; when they are consumed by you, certainly there can be nothing either destructive or unjust, respecting the Americans, in such a monopoly. Are not you, the inhabitants of this kingdom, subjected to like conditions? can you trade where you please, and import what you like? neither velvets nor wrought silks, silk stockings and gloves, lawns, gold and silver lace, cloths, several sorts of iron, and other wares, can be imported by you; and on other commodities the duties are so great, that they amount to a prohibition, but to such as are in opulence. Besides these, you are under the restraints of monopolies, which rescind you from the rights of trading to several parts of the globe; such as those of the East-India, the Turkey, and the Hudson's bay company.

The

The same authority however which established all these commercial restraints in Britain, hath in like manner imposed an internal taxation on land, on light, on most of the necessities of life by actual duties, and eventually on all, before they come to the consumer. Whence, therefore, does it arise; from what principle or precedent in polity does he affirm; that the legislative authority, which has constitutionally effected all these things in Britain, cannot effect the like purposes in America? or from what circumstances does it spring, that the colonies, into which, as he allows, trade hath overflowed with such redundancy of riches, should be unable to afford such taxes as are necessary for their own occasions; whilst you are bound to furnish those for England which are so enormous?

If such be the *state* of England respecting commerce and taxation, according to Mr. Burke it must be a perfect uncompensated *slavery*. And yet under this slavery you have been happy. The foreign trade of your country and the balance of it have amazingly encreased. For in the year 1718, that balance was but 1,585,912*l.* and in 1764, it amounted to 6,179,808*l.* of which balance, the magnified trade of America produced about one seventh. As *you* have increased in wealth, and proceeded in felicity under this authority, what argument can be adduced that the same authority cannot effect the like ends in America? are you to remain content with labouring for the Americans, whilst they untaxed, unless they please, shall revel in a cheap abundance, deride your follies, and renounce that authority which, as subjects, they are bound to obey?

He now adds, "the nation never thought of departing from that choice (relative to America) until the period immediately on the close of the last war. Then a scheme of government, new in many things, seemed to have been adopted. He saw, or thought he saw, several symptoms of a great change whilst he sat in the gallery, a good while before he had the honour of a seat in that house." Or ever thought that honour would be his. Oh what a day was that, for Britain's glory, when Edmund Burke was first entrusted with your rights and liberties! without that vast event, the world had never seen this *speech*.

"At that period, says he, the necessity was established of keeping up no less than twenty new regiments, with twenty colonels, capable of seats in this house. This scheme was adopted with very general applause from all sides, at the very time, that by your conquests in America, your danger from foreign attempts, in that part of the world, was much lessened, or indeed quite over."

In what manner the *parliament* could *establish* a *necessity* of keeping up these regiments seems not to be easily understood. But that the *necessity* of circumstances should induce the parliament to such an *establishment* is within the reach of comprehension. As Hercules traced the oxen into the cave of Cacus, by proceeding contrary to their footsteps; so the words of this gentleman are to be taken in the inverted order. And thus it happens, that the tricks of a thief, and the wiles of an orator may be discovered by observing a similar investigation. Whatever he might think he saw, when he sat in the gallery, it seems sufficiently clear, he did not discern that the reason for this
military

military establishment was that which he considers as rendering such an establishment useless; the Americans having nothing to fear from *foreign* attempts, as the Canadians were then become the subjects of this realm. It was foreseen, however, by the ministry, that this very circumstance of, the Americans having no such enemy to fear, would require a military force to oblige them to that duty which they owe the sovereign authority : more especially as the democratic spirit of the Americans, instigated by the insolence of accumulated riches, would inevitably return to the exercise of their native opposition to this government. These were the *circumstances*, and not the parliament, which *established* the necessity of an army. As to the twenty colonels, who were then made, and capable of feats in parliaments, does he imagine that men of that rank may not be as safely intrusted with the liberties of their country; and be as free from corrupt influence, as a private clerk to a minister, who may have nothing to *lose* but his place?

I pass the remarks on "the country gentleman, " these patrons of œconomy, and resisters of a " standing armed force, who adopted this scheme " with so much applause, and hasten to Mr. " Townshend, who, in a brilliant harangue, did " dazzle the commons, by playing before their " eyes the *image* of a *revenue* to be raised in America." To *dazzle* by an *image* is undoubtedly excellent; but when by prosopopœia, he gives *personality* to *revenue*, and then makes her *dazzling image*, it is incomparable. However, it imparts no bad idea of Mr. Townshend's commencing showman, and playing a puppet; and the house sitting as spectators and applauding him.

Not content with the display of his parts and acquirements in the antecedent subjects, he now deviates from that narrative into the characters of men. In this part you shall see, that the same vanity, the same degree of knowledge, the same preservation of verisimilitude, are exhibited, as in those which he has already delivered. Mr. Grenville is the first minister whom he presumes to delineate. He, it seems, “with no small study
 “of the detail, did not seem to have his view,
 “at least, equally carried to the total circuit of
 “our affairs; he generally considered his objects
 “in lights that were too detached.” And thus he begins this exhibition of his skill in characters with a refinement in observation, that a man who saw things in *detail* and in *detached* lights, did *not* carry his view to the *total* circuit of affairs. As well might he have said that a short-sighted person does not see at a great distance. And then he adds, “Mr. Grenville was of a masculine understanding,” which does not delight in the study of detail, nor is engaged in the contemplation of detached objects. And thus two irreconcilable characteristics, that of attending to the most minute, and to the most extensive objects, are united in the same intellect. Conditions which are as incompatible in the *mind* of man, as that his *body*, chopped into bits, should be nevertheless entire.

He continues his portrait. “Mr. Grenville was
 “bred in a profession, he was bred in the law,
 “which is, in his opinion, one of the first and
 “noblest of human sciences, a science which does
 “more to quicken and invigorate the understanding,
 “than all the other kinds of learning put
 “together; but it is not apt, except in persons
 “very happily born, to open and liberalize the
 “mind

“ mind exactly in the same proportion.” Thus, according to this picture-drawer, Mr. Grenville “ with a masculine understanding, a stout and resolute heart, a first-rate figure in this country, with an ambition to secure to himself a well earned rank in parliament, by a thorough knowledge of its constitution, and a perfect practice in all its business, and with an application undissipated and unwearied, was nevertheless so unhappily born, that his mind could not be opened and liberalized by the law, in exact proportion to the extensiveness of these qualities,” which seems to be somewhat extraordinary. But that was not the whole cause of Mr. Grenville’s being the inadequate man, which this orator represents him. For, “ passing from that study, he did not go very largely into the world, but plunged into business, he means into the business of office, and the limited and fixed methods of forms established there.” That Mr. Grenville did not go very *largely into* the world, nor *out of* it either, is certainly true; for he lived and died extremely *meagre*. But if he mean largely in a figurative sense, he is certainly mistaken. His birth, his connections, his company evince the reverse of that assertion. And into what other place could a man, with all the preceding talents, quickened and invigorated by the science of the law, have gone with more propriety in his progress to the prime ministry, than into office? was it not in that situation that he could instruct himself in the fixed methods and forms established for carrying the conceptions of a masculine understanding and a resolute heart into execution?

He now recovers a little from this disadvantage of office, in which he has placed Mr. Grenville, and adds, “ much knowledge is to be had un-
“ doubtedly

“doubtedly in that line ; and there is no know-
 “ledge which is not *valuable*.” An observation as
 acute as that of a *Welch* juryman, who told the
 judge, if the culprit was *hanged*, his life would be
 in *great danger*. Again he deviates from the merit
 of that official knowledge, and says, “that men
 “too conversant in office, are rarely minds of re-
 “markable enlargement ; their habits of office are
 “apt to give them a turn to think the substance
 “of business not to be much more important than
 “the forms in which it is conducted. These
 “forms are adapted to ordinary occasions ; and
 “therefore persons who are nurtured in office, do
 “admirably well, as long as things go on in the
 “common order ; but when the high roads are
 “broken up and the waters out, when a new and
 “troubled scene is opened, and the file affords
 “no precedent, then it is a greater knowledge of
 “mankind, and a far more extensive *comprehen-*
 “*sion* of things is requisite than ever office gave,
 “or than office can ever give.

Such is his delineation of Mr. Grenville. In-
 consistencies in some degree are probably to be
 found in the characters of all men ; but moral im-
 possibilities in none. Such as a *masculine understand-*
ing, mistaking the *form* for the *substance*. A *stout*
and resolute heart, that was *not* fit to encounter dif-
 ficulties ; a *quickened* and *invigorated* understand-
 ing, adapted to nothing but *ordinary* occasions ;
 a *noble ambition*, and an *unwearied application*,
 which had made him *no more* than a *clerk* in of-
 fice. It is a common artifice of bad painters to
 caricature the features of their portraits, in order
 to make the likenesses more striking. But this
 gentleman draws not from nature, but from a
 fancy, that in all things conjoins such particulari-
 ties,

ties, whether intellectual or substantial, as never can exist in the same object. In this examination of Mr. Grenville's character, I pretend not to distinguish how far your orator is in the right or mistaken, respecting some particular parts separately taken. All I would prove is, that they never did, nor ever can exist in the same person, and therefore that he is absolutely unskilled in the science of human-kind.

I beg one moment's leave to return to Mr. Grenville, for the sake of exhibiting Mr. Burke. "No man can believe," says he, "that *I* mean to lean upon Mr. Grenville's memory." By which I imagine he means to *bear hard* upon it. "Our little party differences have been long ago composed; and *I* have acted more with him, than ever *I* acted against him." *Party-differences*, and *actions* with and against Mr. Grenville, first lord of the Treasury, and chancellor of the Exchequer, by Edmund Burke, clerk to Lord Rockingham, by the curtesy of England called secretary, as every man now is, who knots at the kiln, an account of bricks on a stick, to him who transacts the business of the state. Does he consider his *verbosity* to be *action*? In what other way could he act, either with or against Mr. Grenville? Should Robert Mackreith, Esq; at the end of this session of parliament, talk of acting with or against Edmund Burke, Esq; in his votes, with what profound indignation would the latter resent so offensive a familiarity of expression! and yet honest Bob was *secretary* to Lord Rockingham, and to a number of other lords at the same time; whilst Mr. Burke was *high in air*, meditating on the sublime and beautiful, equally as unsuspecting and unsuspected of ever becoming a member of par-

parliament, as Mr. Mackreith, his brother secretary, or Rumbold, who was Mackreith's.

I pass now to his description of the trade of America. "After the war, and in the last years of it, the trade of America had encreased far beyond the speculations of the most languine imagination; it swelled *out* on every side." It *filled* its proper channels to the *brim*. It *overflowed* with a rich redundancy, and *breaking* its *banks* on the *right* and on the *left*; it spread out on some places where it was indeed improper upon others where it was only irregular." The preceding imagery is taken from a river swollen with ruins. And as in the character of Mr. Grenville, he hath combined moral impossibilities, so in this he hath united natural. The trade swells *out* on every *side*, and yet the *channels* are but *brimful*. It *overflows* its *banks*, and yet it *breaks* them *down*. Here is indeed an overflowing redundancy of sounding words and foaming contradictions, and as Major O'Flaharty says, a very plentiful scarcity of every thing else.

He then tells you "it is the nature of all greatness not to be exact." If the greatness of his oratory be in proportion to his *want* of exactness in this speech, then must every orator, ancient and modern, yield in greatness to Edmund Burke, Esq; and he has fixed a monument more durable than brass. In whom is there to be found such amazing marks of such greatness? words without ideas; affirmation against facts; conclusions which the premises deny; animal vivacity without imagery; reasoning without logic, and arguments which disprove the things they are intended to establish. Such is the redundant want of exactness which shall fix him in an eternal permanency of greatness; whilst that

that of speakers, founded on the opposite qualifications, shall, like the baseless fabric of a vision, dissolve, and leave no wreck behind.

It is his laudable ambition to be constantly exhibiting some new excellence, in the exertion of his intellectual faculties. He now imitates the great Rochefaucault, and turns maxim-maker. "It should stand," says he, "as a fundamental maxim, that no vulgar precaution ought to be employed in the cure of evils, which are closely connected with the cause of our prosperity." *Maxims* have hitherto been considered as a species of *self evident truths*, and *easily* to be put in *practice*. But this *maxim* is in its first part impracticable; and in the second repugnant to common-sense. For by what means can a *precaution*, an act which can only *prevent*, be employed to *cure* an *evil* which is actually *existing*? But let the *hereditary right* of this orator be acknowledged. Let it be supposed, that by *precaution*, which can only be used *before* the evil arrives, he would signify the *means* of curing it *after* it has happened. This metaphor is derived from his knowledge in the art of healing. For of him alone it can be truly said, *he is equally instructed in all things*. I will ask him therefore, if a person afflicted with an ague, or the venereal disease, should consult him, would he abstain from curing them by the bark and mercury, because they are vulgar means; and leave the evil closely connected with his patient's health, because he had no uncommon remedy to effect a cure? If a mortification had seized a limb, or a wen grew on the body of a person, must the surgeon abstain from amputation, because it is the vulgar means of cure; and leave these two evils closely connected with the body?

body? And now I desire to know, on what this *fundamental maxim* can stand, that *never* can or ought to exist?

He then tells you, " Mr. Grenville perhaps turned his eye somewhat less than was just, to the "*incredible* encrease of their fair trade, and looked "*with something of too inquisitive a jealousy to-* "*wards the contraband; and that the bonds of* "*the act of navigation were straitened so much,* "*that America was on the point of having no* "*trade, either contraband or legitimate."* By which I suppose he means *lawful*.

I come now to what your orator stiles " the "*grand manœuvre in the business of regulating* "*the colonies. It was the 15th act of the fourth* "*of George the third, which, besides containing* "*several of the matters to which he hath just be-* "*fore alluded, opened a new principle: and here* "*properly began the second period of the policy* "*of this country with regard to the colonies; by* "*which the scheme of a regular plantation par-* "*liamentary was adopted in theory, and settled* "*in practice, a revenue not substituted in place* "*of, but superadded to a monopoly, was enforced* "*at the same time with additional strictness, and* "*the execution put into military hands."*

"This act had, *for the first time, the title of grant-* "*ing duties in the colonies and plantations of America,* "*and for the first time it was asserted in the pre-* "*amble, that it was just and necessary that a re-* "*venue should be raised there. Then came the* "*technical words of giving and granting; and thus* "*a complete American revenue act was made in* "*all the forms, and with a full avowal of the* "*right, equity, and policy, and even necessity of* "*of taxing the colonies, with any formal consent* of theirs. He

He has already told you, that “ a form of words alters not the nature of the law, nor abridges the power of the law-giver.” I shall therefore say no more respecting the title. But was it not *just* and *necessary* that a revenue should be raised in America? *Just*, because their trade was so *incredibly* encreased, and flowing over with a rich redundancy. *Necessary*, because, in defence of those colonies, this nation is incumbered with a debt of seventy millions? As to the *right* of taxing them, he not only avows that it had been exercised from the reign of king Charles the 2d; but *he* advised, and his minister obtained an act declaratory of the parliamentary right to tax them, without *qualification*. In these circumstances, did not *equity* to you, the subjects of this realm, demand that the Americans should be taxed in alleviation of the oppressions which you bear? Was it not true policy in the minister, to consider your state and prepare to improve it? and did not these circumstances create a *necessity* of taxing the colonies? As to their consent, it never had been asked in former acts of taxation. Could the legislature imagine the consent of the Americans necessary to form a British statute? Had they deviated into that mistake, they had subverted the constitution of this realm, by considering the colony assemblies as part of the supreme legislature? Had his majesty, by his ministers, made a requisition of supplies, he had extended his prerogative to a degree of annihilating the parliamentary authority in America; his ministers had been traitors; and an ignominious death had been the just reward of their treachery to the state. Do not these circumstances afford an indisputable testimony of the *right*, *equity*, *policy*, and *necessity* of such an act, and an ample
justi-

justification of Mr. Grenville's system of raising a revenue on the Americans?

But it seems the preamble contained these remarkable words. "The Commons, &c. being desirous to make *some* provision in the *present* session of parliament, *towards* raising the said revenue." And in your representatives, whose indispensable duty it is to alleviate the burthen of your taxes; was it not a just desire, which ought to be carried into execution? But can the *desire* of parliament, to make *some* provision in the *then* session, *towards* raising a revenue, authorise this speaker to assert, "that it appeared to the colonies, that this act was the beginning of sorrow; that every session was to produce something of the same kind; that the parliament was to go on from day to day, in charging them with such taxes as they pleased; for such a military force as they should think proper." And what is there in all this, more than is constitutionally done, in this kingdom, every session of parliament? And where he tells you, "the execution of the act was put into military hands," if he mean that the army was to collect the tax, he knows he utters an untruth, with malevolence premeditated to inflame you against the ministry. In one moment you shall see him contradict this behaviour of the Americans and himself.

"Had this plan been pursued," says he, "it was evident that the provincial assemblies, in which the Americans felt all their portion of importance, and beheld their sole image of freedom, were *ipso facto* annihilated." It seems probable, that the corporation of London is more ancient than the existence of a house of Commons, and there is no certainty when it was first instituted,
being

being by prescription antecedent to any subsisting charter. When the parliament took place, as it now exists, and the supreme legislative authority laid duties on the Londoners, were "their portion of importance and sole image of freedom annihilated?" Have they and the other incorporated bodies, hitherto conceived that such was the effect of the *parliamentary power* being superior to that of the charteral? How then could this constitutional authority offer "an ill prospect to the Americans that seemed boundless in extent, and endless in duration?" He tells you, however, "they were not mistaken." And what are the reasons he adduces in proof that the prospect was boundless, and endless? It was, because "the ministry valued themselves when this act passed, and when they gave notice of the stamp act, that both of the duties came very far short of their ideas of American taxation." And then, on this proof of the inefficacy of these taxes, he adds, great "was the applause of these measures here." Thus the *ministry* valued themselves and were *applauded* for that in which they had *miscarried*. "In England, however, we cried out for new taxes on America, whilst they cried out they were nearly crushed with those which the war, and their own grants had brought upon them." And from these two *outcries*, he has drawn these *conclusions*, that "the Americans were *not mistaken*." That "the American importance, and their sole image of freedom were annihilated, and the prospect of being reduced to nothing was become *boundless in extent, and endless in duration*."

When the mile stones were first erected on the Oxford road, a village, that had been hitherto reckoned to be *five*, was now found to be *seven*

miles from that city. On this an old woman of the village made a lamentable *outcry* against the cruelty of the turnpike commissioners. For when the road consisted but of *five miles*, said she, I could walk very well to Oxford: but now they have made it *seven*, I can go no more there. And thus she lost her *portion of importance and sole image of freedom*. I do not infer from hence, that this celebrated speaker reasons like an old woman; it is only to shew, that similar geniuses do frequently coincide in the manner of forming conclusions from like premises.

He now tells you, "it has been said in the debate, that when the first American revenue act (the act in 1764 imposing the port duties) passed, the Americans did not object to the principle; it is true they touched it but very gently. It was not a direct attack." And thus this orator, restless until he hath demolished his own edifice, becomes an evidence against himself; and amply testifies that the very act, which he asserts, had given the prospect, to the Americans, of their importance and their freedom being annihilated, had "passed without any objection, to the principle, or with a light touch only." The reason is, "they did not consider it as a direct attack;" and therefore they never could have fancied any such boundless prospect, or eternity of duration, as he mentions. And now, consistent in inconsistency alone, he assigns the reasons why they could *not* have had such a prospect; "they were as yet novices; as yet unaccustomed to direct attacks upon any of the rights of parliament. The duties were port duties, like those they had been accustomed to bear, with this difference, that the title was not the same, the preamble not
" the

“ the same, and the spirit altogether unlike.” And thus having deposed in contradiction to himself, he brings arguments to prove, that with all these additional circumstances, the duties were such as they were accustomed to bear ; that therefore they had neither a right to object to the law, nor a motive to create that visionary prospect which he describes, and that by now *first attacking the rights of parliament*, they began their progress to rebellion.

He now asks, “ of what service is this observation (*that the Americans did not object to the parliament authority*) to the cause of those that make it? it is a full refutation for the pretence of their present cruelty to America; for it shews, out of their own mouths, that our colonies were backwards to enter into the present vexations and ruinous controversy.” From hence, it should appear, that the ministry have made the *acquiescence* of the Americans with the act of 1764, a *pretence* for their present cruelty, as he calls it. Otherwise how can that conduct, in the colonists, be a refutation of that pretence? but is that the case? and when it shews out of the ministry’s own mouths, that the colonies were backwards to enter into the present controversy, does it not shew also, out of the orator’s, when they resist what they had *never* before *objected to*, that they rebelled against their own convictions. And therefore they ought to be compelled to obey that parliamentary authority, which antecedently they never had opposed, and now presume *directly to attack*?

He advances with equal success in the subsequent affirmation. “ There is also another circulation abroad (spread with a malignant intention, which he cannot attribute to those who

“ say the same thing in the house) that Mr. Grenville gave the colony agents an option for their assemblies to tax themselves, which they had refused. He finds much stress is laid on this as a fact. However, it happens neither to be true nor possible.” I shall confront this hardy assertion by an evidence not to be refuted. It was printed in the London Evening Post, Feb. 28, and subscribed *Israel Mauduit*.

“ In the beginning of March 1764, a number of resolutions, relative to the plantation trade, were proposed by Mr. Grenville, and passed in the house of commons.—The fifteenth of these was, that towards the further defraying the said expences, it may be proper to charge certain stamp duties on the said colonies and plantations. The other resolutions were formed into the plantation act, and the fifteenth was put off till the next session, Mr. Grenville declaring that he was willing to give time to the colonies to consider of it, and to make their option of raising that or some other tax. The agents waited separately on Mr. Grenville upon this matter, and wrote to their several colonies. At the end of the session, we went to him, all of us together, to know if he still intended to bring in such a bill; he answered, he did; and then repeated to us, in form, what I had heard him say before in private; and in the house of commons; that the late war had found us seventy millions, and left us more than one hundred and forty millions in debt. He knew that all men wished not to be taxed; but that in these unhappy circumstances, it was his duty, as a steward for the public, to make use of every just means of improving the public revenue: “ that

“ that he never meant, however, to charge the
 “ colonies with any part of the interest of the
 “ national debt. But besides that public debt,
 “ the nation had incurred a great annual expence
 “ in the maintaining of the several new conquests,
 “ which we had made during the war, and by
 “ which the colonies were so much benefited.
 “ That the American civil and military establish-
 “ ment, after the peace of Aix la Chapelle, was
 “ only 70,000*l.* per annum. It was now encreased
 “ to 350,000*l.* This was a great additional ex-
 “ pence incurred upon an American account:
 “ and he thought, therefore, that America ought
 “ to contribute towards it. He did not expect
 “ that the colonies should raise the whole, but
 “ some part of it he thought they ought to raise,
 “ and this stamp-act was intended for that pur-
 “ pose.”

“ That he judged this method of raising the
 “ money the easiest and most equitable; that it
 “ was a tax which would fall only upon property;
 “ would be collected by the fewest officers; and
 “ would be equally spread over America and the
 “ West-Indies; so that all would bear their share
 “ of the public burthen.

“ He then went on, I am not however set upon
 “ this tax; if the Americans dislike it, and pre-
 “ fer any other method of raising the money
 “ themselves, I shall be content. Write therefore
 “ to your several colonies, and if they chuse any
 “ other mode, I shall be satisfied, provided the
 “ money be but raised.”

This conversation was transmitted to the colonies,
 by their agents, to which they received the follow-
 ing answers.

Boston, June 14, 1754.

“ Sir,

“ The house of representatives have received
 “ your several letters, &c. The actual laying the
 “ stamp duty, you say, is deferred till next year.
 “ Mr. Grenville being willing to give the pro-
 “ vinces their option to raise that, or some other
 “ equivalent tax, desirous, as he was pleased to
 “ express himself, to consult the ease and quiet,
 “ and the good will of the colonies.—If the
 “ ease, the quiet, and the good will of the co-
 “ lonies are of any importance to Great Britain,
 “ no measure could be hit upon that hath a more
 “ natural and direct tendency to enervate those
 “ principles, than the resolutions you enclosed.
 “ The kind offer of suspending this stamp duty
 “ in the manner, and upon the condition you
 “ mention, amounts to no more than this: that
 “ if the colonies will not tax themselves, as they
 “ may be directed, the parliament will tax them.
 “ —You are to remonstrate against these mea-
 “ sures, and, if possible, to obtain a repeal of
 “ the sugar act, and prevent the imposition of
 “ any further duties or taxes on the colonies:
 “ measures will be taken that you may be joined
 “ by all the other agents.”

From hence it is evident, that Mr. Grenville did indisputably propose to the colonies the raising of a duty adequate to the purpose of the stamp-act; and that these refractory colonists did positively refuse to accept that offer. Thus it is demonstrated, that what this accurate orator pronounces to be neither *true* nor *possible*, are *real facts*. After this I shall not trouble you with refuting the reasons which he brings to prove, that what did
 certainly

certainly exist, had no *existence*. It is true, that the act of 1764 is, in your orator's account, so blended with that of the stamp-act of 1765, that it looks as if he had mixed them in this manner from a consciousness of being open to immediate confutation without that artifice ; and by these means that he intended to escape detection, like the ink fish, which blackens the waters, and renders the spot, in which he lies, invisible to his pursuers. Even the letter of governor Bernard, which he quotes, must have convinced him, that the preceding proposal of Mr. Grenville was relative to the stamp-act only ; but as he adduces this transcript as a proof, that the Americans, burthened as they were, were not then taxable ; as it comes from a respectable authority, it merits your consideration. " The American governments had, in the prosecution of the late war, contracted very large debts, which it will take some years to pay off, and in the mean time occasion very burdensome taxes for that support only ; for instance, this government (the Massachusetts) which is as much before-hand as any, raises every year 37,500*l.* sterling, for sinking their debt, and must continue it for four years longer at least, before it will be clear."

This inability founded on their debts, incurred in the last war, which concluded with *happiness*, *security*, and *opulence* to them ; is an argument, than which nothing can be more inconclusive. In this war undertaken for these Americans, this colony ran in debt 150,000*l.* which they can discharge in *four years* ; and you, of this kingdom, for their defence, incurred a debt of 70,000,000*l.* for the liquidation of which, the duration of the world will not allow a time sufficient. The interest of

that immense sum, you, your children, and all succeeding generations, are mortgaged to pay, by the sweat of your brows; whilst these traitorous Americans, wantoning in ease and opulence, refuse to contribute to the payment of those taxes which are requisite for the support of their own governments! Such is the object of their rebellious opposition. Such is the boon, which this orator, and their abettors are labouring to obtain for them! and under the deceitful mask of *patriotism*, to *annihilate* the supreme rights of their *own* country, and by the *sound* of *liberty* to oblige you incessantly to toil as *slaves* for traitors. It is their interest, their ambition, their lust of power, their private ends, to which *these patriots* tend, under the ostentatious pretext of *public virtue*. And now in the words of your orator, I shall say, “thus I have disposed of this falsehood;” but as he tells you, “falsehood has a perennial spring,” I will, therefore, pursue him through the remainder of his speech, and stick to him like desperation to a nabob’s conscience.

He now tells you, “it is said, that no conjecture could be made of the dislike of the colonists to the principle. This is as untrue as the other.” It is precisely in the same predicament, and you shall have the proof from himself; the *principle* is the *legislative authority*, and to *that authority*, respecting the act of 1764, he has already told you the Americans did not object. Whence then could the conjecture arise, that they would oppose that *principle* in the next year, the *right* of which they had *acknowledged* in the former? but there is no necessity of receding to his past sayings for a confutation of himself. The passage which immediately follows is adequate to that end.

“ After

“ After the resolution of the house,” says he, “ and before the passing of the stamp-act, the colonies of the Massachusset’s Bay and New York did send remonstrances, objecting to this *mode* of parliamentary taxation.” And thus he concludes, that the *principle*, the *legislative authority*, is the same with the *laws* it makes, or the *mode* of taxation; and therefore because the Americans disliked the thing *created*, they objected to the *creator* also. Thus an *aversion* from a *toad* is a *dislike* to the *deity*.

He then asks, “ what was the consequence ? ” The remonstrances were suppressed, they were put under the table, notwithstanding an order of council to the contray, by the ministry which composed the very council that had made the order ; and thus the house proceeded to its business of taxing, without the least regular knowledge of the objections which were made to it.” Which is, if I understand this passage, that the house of Commons ordered these remonstrances to be put under the table, notwithstanding an order of council to keep them above board. A right which the Commons ought to exert in opposition to all *orders of council*. But the true reason was, that when the house was acquainted with the true disposition of the Americans, by their agents, and their own letters; and that they were determined not to obey the parliamentary authority, they acted as a British senate, and every legislative authority ought to act. They would not permit the sovereignty of the realm to become a subject of debate, or called in question. Such a proceeding would have pronounced them to be traitors to their trust and to the state ; besides the eternal objection of being judges in their own cause. They therefore rightly proceed

proceed to the business of taxing the Americans in contempt of every objection, and the stamp act was passed.

“ This,” says he, “ was the state of the colonies, before his majesty thought fit to change his ministry; it stands upon *no* authority of his.” Indeed he has no authority for what he has said, and consequently the whole has no foundation, as it has been fully proved by incontrovertible records. “ Mr. Cornwall,” he says, “ has desired some of them to lay their hands upon their hearts, and answer to his queries upon the historical part of this consideration, and by his manner he seemed to address himself to him. He will answer him with great openness; he has nothing to conceal.” By thus assuming to *himself* this address of Mr. Cornwall to *some* of them, would you not imagine that he had been chancellor of the Exchequer, or leader of ministerial business in the house, during the Rockingham administration, whose uprightness had nothing to fear or to conceal? But you shall hear what he says of himself, with an account of whom he begins the historical part of this consideration, like *the memoirs of P. P. clerk of this parish*. “ In the year sixty-five, being in a private station, far enough from any line of business, and not having the honour of a seat in this house, it was my fortune,” says he, “ unknowing and unknown to the then ministry, by the intervention of a common friend, to become connected with a very noble person, and at the head of the Treasury department.” Fortunate to *him*, but fatal to his *friend*. The deed hung heavy on his soul. He——— but I will proceed no further in the relation of an event, by which we lost a man,
whose

whose sensations were too delicate to bear the disappointments of mistaken friendship.

“ It was,” he adds, “ indeed in a situation of
 “ little rank, and no consequence, suitable to the
 “ mediocrity of my talents and pretensions.” It
 was indeed in that of being private secretary to
 Lord Rockingham. But since he so humbly speaks
 of his *mediocrity of talents*, his *little rank*, and his
no consequence, how comes it to pass, that he thought
 Mr. Cornwall addressed himself to him ? He tells
 you indeed, “ it was only as well as his eyes could
 “ discern it.” From his own words you shall de-
 rive the true reason. “ But a situation near
 “ enough,” says he, “ to see as well as others
 “ what was going on.” And hence it results, as
 men *must* always *see what is going on* in proportion to
 their *powers of discernment*, that he *pretends* to possess
 an understanding equal to the minister himself, or
 any of his coadjutors; or that the minister saw things
 according to the *mediocrity* of his secretary’s talents.
 That the former was the *pretension* of your orator is
 evident beyond dispute; for says he, “ I *did* see in
 “ that noble person such sound principles ; such
 “ an enlargement of mind ; such clear and saga-
 “ cious sense, and such an unshaken fortitude, as
 “ have bound me, as well as others much better
 “ than me, by an invincible attachment to him
 “ from that forward.” Thus you find, as he
 could see as well as others, what was going on,
 and this minister was *one* of the *things* which was
 going on, he must, logically, include all the great
 qualities of his master ; or how could he have seen
 things so well as *he* did ? And hence you must per-
 ceive that the *badness* of his eyes, being unable to
 extend their views to the end of his vanity ; it was
 by

by the influence of the latter that he appropriated Mr. Cornwall's address to himself alone.

As to his *attachment* to the noble lord, I harbour no doubt, that it is as firm as that of the ivy to the wall, and for the same reason, that of being *supported*. You all know it is impossible for *one man* to determine what *another* sees; and therefore I can neither affirm nor deny, that Mr. Burke saw those amazing qualities in the then first lord of the Treasury. I shall take the liberty of hinting only, that as this orator *bears* what does *not* sound to other *ears*, so he may see what is *invisible* to the discernment of other mens *eyes*. I shall, however, examine the conduct of *that* minister as freely as *his* secretary has enquired into those of other ministers; and then leave it to your determination, whether these superlative qualities are become visible to you.

I pass the conduct of Lord Rockingham, respecting the Spanish trade of America, because Mr. Burke "believes he soon saw his way in that business." For he was his *guide, philosopher, and friend*. And "the alarm which was taken by the whole body in office, when his lordship began to open his ground." Because those hostile preparations produced nothing to the present purpose. "The first step the noble lord took, was to have the opinion of his excellent, learned, and *ever-lamented* friend the late Mr. York," more particularly as he deserted him for the seals. "When his lordship knew that formally and officially, which in substance he had known before," from Mr. Burke; whose *masculine understanding* had been quickened by the science of the law, which makes *more* knaves than all the others upon earth. "He immediately dispatched orders to redress the grievance," respecting the Spanish trade.

trade. And Mr. Burke will say,— *willful* will do it. “ For the then minister, he is of that constitution of mind, that he knows he would have issued, on the same critical occasion, the very same orders, if the acts of trade had been, as they were not, directly against him; and would have cheerfully submitted to the equity of parliament for his indemnity.”

Now it appears to me, that this panegyrist of Lord Rockingham, would have acted, to the full, as judiciously, if he had said nothing of this noble lord's *constitution of mind*. Because so prevalent a *disposition* to act against law, on his *own* authority, does not seem to be the best adapted for being entrusted with the executive powers of a free state. And I would willingly believe, that the secretary has discerned *no* such constitution in his master. For it can never be a characteristic that will recommend him to his *sovereign*; or which ought to be esteemed by you the *subjects*. Besides this, his lordship does, I imagine, remember, that a king was once driven from the throne of this realm, for *dispensing* with the *laws*; and that the *bill of rights* pronounces such acts *illegal*, even in a *sovereign*. Can a *minister*, with prudence, therefore rely on the *indemnity* of parliament for such transgressions as have banished kings? Besides this, does he not recollect, that an illustrious ancestor, than whom no mortal ever had a more illustrious, died on the scaffold, for such transactions as the laws could make *no crime*; although the blood-thirsty, and rebellious progenitors of those very fanatics, whose unnatural cause his lordship now supports, doomed him most murderously to death. Awake, my lord, awake, fly from your deluders; return to the glorious and the virtuous principles

principles of the great earl of Stafford; your king, your country, your noble lineage, every laudable sensation of humanity invoke you to it. Shall a *Wentworth* join with the abettors of rebellion, and plead the cause of men descended from those who put his guiltless ancestor to death, and whose principles would now doom him to a like fate?

Your orator continues. "It was not till the end of October that the news of the troubles, on account of the stamp act, arrived in England. No sooner had the sound of that mighty tempest reached us in England, than the whole of the then opposition, instead of feeling humbled by the unhappy issue of their measures; seemed to be infinitely elated, and cried out, that the ministry, from envy to the glory of their predecessors, were prepared to repeal the stamp act."

As "this *seeming to be infinitely elated*, at the *unhappy* issue of their *own* measures; and that this *elation* should produce an outcry, that the ministry, from *envy* to the *glory* of their predecessors, were prepared to repeal the stamp act," appears to be extremely *unnatural*, I shall presume to assign another motive to this moral phænomenon. When this preceeding news arrived, the then opposition were not *elated* on the late *unhappy* issue of their *own* measures, but on that of the then ministry, who, when in opposition, by their harangues on the illegality of internally taxing the Americans, had filled their heads with falacious notions, and their hearts with the traitorous resolutions of resisting the legislative authority. The opposition saw the new ministry caught in their own toils, and instead of envying them the glory of the repeal, were *elated*; for such is the nature of man, that this mighty *tempest* had reached your shores, by
which

which they must be wrecked in the repeal of the stamp act, cast on shore and stripped of power, place, interest, and esteem. That the event will justify this manner of thinking, cannot be well called in question. And this, I imagine, will offer a better reason for this *joy* of opposition; than the *unhappy* issue of their *own* measures; for misfortunes are seldom accompanied with *pleasure*..

Your orator persists. "I do," says he, "put my hand upon my heart, and assure them, that they did *not* come to a resolution directly to repeal. They weighed this matter as its difficulty and importance required. They considered maturely among themselves. They considered with all who could give advice or information. It was not determined but a little before the meeting of parliament. But it was determined, and the main lines of their own plan marked out before that meeting. Two questions arose, (I hope I am not going into a narrative troublesome to the house.) *

"[A cry of, go on, go on.]"

Oh, vanity, how stupendous is thy power on the heart of man! This orator of *too scrupulous a delicacy*, inserts in his printed speech, that which, he imagines, was an oblation of applause at the altar of his pre-eminence.

Before I proceed to a farther examination of the conduct of the Rockingham ministry, it is absolutely requisite that I lay before you of what this American tempest consisted. And that no intent
to

* Bathos, chap. 10. Apoplopesis.

to delude you by misrepresentation may be imputed to me, I will give it in your orator's own words. " The resolutions of the assemblies were
 " violent ; the insurrections universal ; the stamp
 " papers were seized and burned ; the stamp of-
 " ficers forced to resign their commissions under
 " the gallows ; the houses of the magistrates were
 " rifled and pulled down ; they expelled from the
 " country all who dared to write or speak a single
 " word in defence of the powers of parliament.*

Such were the horrors that characterised this American tempest, and never were a captain and a crew so astonished and struck with terror, as the new minister and his associates, who had undertaken the conduct of the political ship. They were all in the state of Scapin's master, each asking, *what the devil had he to do on ship-board ?*

Conviction came too late. They saw that their speeches, in opposition to the parliamentary authority of taxing America, had produced not only a determined disobedience to the right of imposing *internal* but *external* taxes also ; and they feared that nothing less than an absolute renunciation of the legislative authority of this realm over the colonies could calm this tempest in America. This horrible apparition was accompanied with another not less terrifying ; a dread that the renouncing of the sovereign legislative right would not only expose them to utter detestation and contempt in Britain, and in all the nations of the earth, but that such a pusillanimity of conduct must speedily dismit them from power and office, if they disregarded the late resolution of the commons, *firmly and effectually* to support his majesty.

to

* Speech, p. 71.

to suppress those rebellious insurrections. At the same time, without yielding to the demands, which they, in their harangues, had so strenuously pronounced to be the rights of the colonies, they knew not how to extricate themselves from their embarrassments on that side. Thus, like rats, seduced, by the love of bacon, into a wire-trap, the new ministry found themselves unable to get *out*, or to stay *in* with safety. No terms can more aptly express their terrible perplexity, than those which your orator hath offered in their justification.

“The first of the two considerations, says he, “was whether the repeal should be total, or “whether only partial, taking out every thing “burthensome and productive, and reserving only “an empty acknowledgement, such as a *stamp* on “cards or dice.” Hence it appears, that the first consideration of those new statemen, who had opposed the *stamp-act* as illegal, was to *prove*, they had acted *against* their *consciences*, by keeping a stamp-act still existing. But this they soon perceived would not succeed. Conscience had no business to interfere in that affair. Thus their own professions, pursuits, and pretended principles, that the parliament had no right to tax America, being unrepresented, served them as the wires served the rats. They had let them in, but on attempting to get out, they ran in their faces, and made them too sore for further attempts of escaping that way. For this *empty* acknowledgement of a parliamentary right to lay a stamp duty on cards or dice, like the orator’s *empty recital*, would have been brimful of ruin to their continuance in the ministry. As all mankind would have then seen their abandoned conduct; in having opposed that very

right and that very tax which they would now exert and continue exactly in the same manner which they condemned. Such a transaction would have rendered them not only detested as men void of principle; but ridiculous as divested of common understanding. Yet even that intention, so demonstrative of their injustice, in opposing Mr. Grenville; so replete with the exhibition of their own folly by its having been once in meditation; and so needless to be revealed at present, hath the wisdom of your responsible orator laid before the commons in *sounds*, and your in *print*! Is it not probable that, from a persuasion, that such *derogating discoveries* would proceed from his attempting to *justify* himself and his master, that the cry of *go on, go on*, arose, which he attributes to the *approbation* of his auditors.

“ The other question, he adds, was on what principle the act should be repealed.” Hence it is clear, that these ministers, when in opposition, had opposed this act on *no principle*. For had they acted on *principle*, that on which it was *opposed* would have *equally* served for its being *repealed*. However, “ on the head of this principle two principles were started.” This starting of *two* principles upon the *head* of *one* principle is a happy imitation of his favourite authority.* One of these was, “ that the legislative rights of this country, with regard to America, were not entire, but had certain restrictions and limitations.” This, although it were the chief argument on which, in opposition, they had exploded the parliamentary right of taxing America, they were withheld from carrying into execution. And does

* Bathos. chap. 10. Of the variegating, confounding, and reversing figures.

does not that circumstance fully evince that their former arguments, and their consciences had been constantly at war; or that their fortitude was unequal to the demands to which those declarations had reduced them? This discovery shews you also that your orator is undesignedly battering the place he would defend.

“ The other principle was, that taxes of this
 “ kind were contrary to the fundamental principles of commerce, on which the colonies were
 “ founded; and contrary to every idea of political equity; by which equity we are bound as
 “ much as possible to extend the spirit and benefit
 “ of the British constitution to every part of the
 “ British dominions.” But on what ground is this principle supported? is the peremptory averment of this orator sufficient to obtain it credit? the experience of all ages contradicts this opinion. For, in what state, either ancient or modern, founded on commercial principles, was there no internal taxation? was such the case at Tyre, Carthage, Athens, or any other commercial realm of antiquity? is it so, at this day, in Venice, Genoa, or Holland? The constitution of England indeed was not founded on commercial principles. Yet so much of these principles hath been woven into its original fabric since its commencement, that it may, not improperly, be deemed a commercial government. And such is the fact, that *internal taxes* have been multiplied with the *augmentation* of her trade. That trade alone hath supplied the means of payment. And by that trade the nation hath been amazingly enriched. This being the spirit of the British constitution; whence does it arise that it is contrary to every idea of *political equity*, to proceed in a similar mode in America? as

this speaker affirms, "we are bound, as much as possible, by that *equity*, to extend the *spirit* and the *benefit* of the British constitution to every part of the British dominions." And thus, in compliance with his own precepts, he and his minister *extended* the spirit of the British constitution into America, by *abrogating* a law which was made in conformity to the undeviating practice of that very *constitution*?

He continues, "the option both of the measure, and of the principle of the repeal was made before the session; and I wonder, says he, how any one can read the king's speech, at the opening of that session, without seeing in that speech, both the repeal and the declaratory act very sufficiently crayoned out. Those who cannot see this can see nothing." It was under that *ministry alone*, that in the speech from the throne, the parliament hath been informed what laws they were to repeal, and what to support. Was it not an *invasion* on the rights of the subjects by which those ministers were guilty of high crimes and misdemeanour? and yet it is avowed by Edmund Burke, *then clerk* to lord Rockingham, who *now* presents himself, in this defence, as the chief and *responsible minister* of *state*. But as these two acts were only *crayoned* out in sketches, and probably by *himself*, it so happened that the usual unintelligibility of his designs accompanied them. And thus the meaning of them was fortunately concealed from all but *himself* and his *disciples*.

"A partial repeal," says he, "or as the *bon ton* of the court then was, a *modification*, would have satisfied a timid, unsystematic, procrastinating ministry, as such a measure has since done

"such

“ such a ministry.” It seems probable that an assertion so confident, till that moment, had never been uttered in the face of men, who stood convinced that the short duration of that feeble ministry consisted solely of timidity, want of system, and procrastination. This you shall see indisputably evinced. And then the comparison of their conduct, and that of the present ministry shall falsify the latter assertion, and prove that “the very modification which is the constant resource of weak undeceiving minds,” was that which attended the Rockingham administration in this affair.

“ To repeal,” says he, “ by a denial of our right to tax, in the preamble (and this too did not want advisers) would have cut, in the heroic stile, the Gordian knot with a sword.” A sword composed of a majority of votes in the house of commons. “ Either measure, he continues, would have cost no more than a day’s debate.” What an execrable idea of the sovereign legislative authority of this kingdom does that audacious assertion impart. The *king*, the *lords*, the *commons* would have rescinded the lawful power of the realm; and the rights of the people; and have absolutely subverted this constitution, had lord Rockingham thought it proper. It is an assertion such as hath never been pronounced by the lips of any man, antecedent to this speech. It is an assertion so replete with indignity to the *peers*, and your *representatives*, that nothing but a settled contempt for him that spoke it, could have permitted its passing with impunity. It is an imputation of abandoned profligacy, carried up even to the *throne* itself; when at no time, since the sun hath risen on this kingdom, did the diadem surround the head of any sovereign who less deserved

so impious an outrage on his character. His steadiness and zeal to sustain the legislative authority through all his dominions, even when the Americans are taking arms to place his prerogative superior to that power, pronounce the preceding passage, of this orator, to be a calumny unprecedented in the history of the world, and in the malevolence of man.

He persists. " But when the total repeal was adopted ; and adopted on principles of policy, of equity, and of commerce ; this plan made it necessary to enter into many and difficult measures." Of their principles of policy, equity, and commerce, I have already spoken. It shall soon be confirmed by their own conduct in getting out of their difficulties, of what they consisted. And now I will regale you with a passage, that excels, in the Babylonish jargon of unintelligible metaphor, all that has hitherto appeared, either in speech or writing.

" It became necessary," says he, " to open a very large *field of evidence, commensurate to these extensive views* ; but then this *labour did knights service*. It opened the *eyes* of several to the true state of the American affairs : it *enlarged their ideas* ; it *removed prejudices* ; and it *conciliated the opinions and affections* of men." This figure, so replete with impracticable and incongruous imagery, is taken from his idea of the old feudal government of this realm. The *villains*, or *slaves*, whose business it was to drudge in husbandry, *opened a very large field*. You have heard of a *field of corn*, a *field of bay*, a *field of pasture*, and a *field of battle* ; but when was a *field of evidence* ever opened before the 19th April, 1774. This *field*, however, so *necessary for evidence*, was not for the
at-

attainment of *truth* and *knowledge* from the testimonies to be brought before the parliament. It was to give the ministry a *fine prospect*, commensurate to their *extensive views*, which seems to be an odd business for *evidence*. But then this *labour of slaves and villains*, did *knights service*. And thus their *bedging and ditching*; and *opening of fields*, was the *service of freemen*; the *attending of their sovereign* and their *lords in arms*, and at their *courts*? This being so strange an innovation, one would imagine it might have sufficed for any man. But a genius of such magnitude as is your orator, is not to be contented with being *his own parallel*, he will *excel himself*. And therefore this *villains knights service*, did not consist in *opening of fields*, nor in *bearing arms*, but in *opening of eyes*; and thus it did the service of an *oculist*. It stopped not there. It *enlarged ideas*, and thus it did the service of *learning*. It removed *prejudices*, and thus it did the service of *philosophy*. It *conciliated mens opinions*, and thereby served as a *peace-maker*. Hence it appears that the minister was a *villain*, a *knight*, an *oculist*, a *preceptor*, a *philosopher*; and a *justice of the peace*, all at one time, and on the same business. With what luxuriant exhibition of the *profund*, are your minds regaled! * Imitated from those passages, where the Almighty is represented as a *mercator*, a *baker*, a *butler*, a *goldbeater*, a *fuller*, &c. But the preceding profundities in the bathos were selected from a variety of passages in several books. In this unparalleled speech of this celebrated author, they stand like soldiers in a line, with each a *different uniform*.

L. 4

It

* Ch. 5. of the true genius for the profund, and by what it is constituted.

It would, however, be a flagrant injustice to deny, that the nimbleness of his imagination, in leaping from one object to another, is prodigious. The great Socrates is represented as being an admirer of agility, and to measure the leaps of that wonder of agility a flea. I would therefore hope, that this *great* orator will not be offended at my comparing his *nimble* fancy with that minute existence. I confess, however, the *former never flings*. They both leap from spot to spot, in such directions as express no intent of proceeding to any particular end. They are invisible in their passage from place to place. At every pause you are constantly surprized to see them, where they were never expected: until at length they both disappear, by springing, the Lord knows whither.

Such being the numerous employments in which the minister was then engaged. He tells you, "the noble Lord Rockingham, who then took the *lead* in administration." Your orator still going *before* him, like the mace-bearer preceding the speaker of the Commons, to express his dignity and direct the way. "His honoured friend under him, Mr. Dowdeswell; and a right hon. gentleman, general Conway (if he will not reject his share, and it was a large one in his business) exerted the most laudable industry, in bringing before the house the fullest, most important, and least *garbled* body of evidence that were ever produced to that house." To *garble* a *parcel* of evidence, may be allowable in figure; but the *brokers* declare, a *body* is *not* to be *garbled*, either in *fact* or *figure*.

He now tells you, "the enquiry," which included all the preceding services, "lasted in the
"com-

“ committee for six weeks ; and at its conclusion
 “ this house, by an independent, noble, spirited,
 “ and unexpected majority ; by a majority that
 “ will redeem all the acts ever done by majorities
 “ in parliament.” Will it redeem the riot act,
 the septennial act, the acts that have mortgaged
 your ancestors and yourselves, and will continue the
 same burthen on your posterity for the payment
 of the interest of those millions which were raised
 in support of Dutchmen and Germans in former
 wars, and of the Americans in the last ? If the
 mischief of all these, and a number of other acts
 be redeemed, by repealing this stamp act, on what
 account do the ministry proceed, as if these statutes
 were still in full energy ? why do you pay these
taxes, which are *redeemed* by parliament ? why is
 the minister unimpeached that still dares to collect
 them ? Otherwise is it not a *redemption*, where *no-*
thing is *redeemed* ? An imposition on your under-
 standings attempted by this orator, who thus pre-
 sumes to treat you as an undiscerning populace ?
 But whence did this sudden transformation arise,
 of being independent, noble, and spirited in
 this majority, who you are told, in this very page,
 of his oration, were ready to have *denied* the British
 right of taxing the Americans ? This readiness,
 and that which would have been the effect of its
 being employed, may probably be deemed, an act
 of a noble and spirited majority, by this orator.
 But were there no *dependent* members who contri-
 buted to that majority ? Could it have been *unex-*
pected, by *him*, when he has already declared,
 they were *sure* that it would have cost but a day’s
 debate to renounce the British authority over Ame-
 rica ? He is eternally combating his own asser-
 tions,

tions, like a cock that fights with his own image in a glass, unknowing that it is himself. Could but this propitiatory act of redemption, extend its influence to the other world, what a multitude of members would then ascend from the depths of Erebus, to dwell in the celestial mansions!

“ However, this act of redemption was accomplished in the teeth of all the old mercenary
 “ Swifs of state ; in despite of all the speculators
 “ and augurs of political events ; in defiance of
 “ the whole embattled legion of veteran pensioners, and practised instruments of court, gave
 “ a total repeal to the stamp act ; and (if it had
 “ been so permitted) a lasting peace to this
 “ whole empire.” It will be no easy task to discover a passage *more* replete with the spirit of malignancy, and with *less* of the spirit of truth and satire. His arrows are altogether pointless, and even his bolts do not bruise, although they be soon shot. The whole is a venomous parody of that language, which is so successfully practised by the ladies, who, for their amusement, traffic in fish. By the Swifs of state, I imagine he means state Swifs. And on this occasion, the *old* and mercenary were supplied by the *new* and mercenary, who opposed *their* teeth to *those* of the *others* ; few of whom did not pass into the same service under the new leader. Even the despite of speculators and augurs in political events, was opposed by a like motive in like men ; and a *new* legion of *new* pensioners, in which most of the *old* enlisted, was embattled on this occasion of repealing the stamp act. For by what other than mercenary means, was a majority obtained in all that parliament ? It is true indeed, that the repeal of the stamp act would have given as lasting a peace
 to

the empire of this kingdom over America, as severing the head of Charles the first with an axe, did to his sovereignty over this kingdom. But in political diseases, death is sometimes but apparent, and there the means of recovering subsists. Such was happily the case in this instance.

“ I state,” says your orator, “ these particulars, “ because this act of spirit and fortitude, has lately “ been, in the circulation of the season, and in “ some hazarded declamations in this house, attributed to timidity. If the conduct of ministry, “ in proposing the repeal, had arisen from timidity, with regard to themselves, it would have “ been greatly to be condemned. Interested timidity disgraces as much in the cabinet, as personal timidity does in the field. But timidity, “ with regard to the well-being of our country, “ is heroic virtue.” By the *circulation* of the season, for surely no season *circulates*, I imagine he means the *progression* of it. It is his *prescriptive* right, in *words*, to bend the inflexible straight lines of nature into circles, but never to make the crooked paths straight. I will examine this idea of timidity, which your orator has delivered. “ Interested timidity he allows, disgraces as much in the cabinet, as personal timidity does in the field ; but *timidity*, with regard to the *well-being* of our *country*, is *heroic virtue*.” Hence it follow, that the minister, who *trembles* with *fear*, when the *well-being* of his *country* calls him forth to arduous action, is a *man* both *virtuous* and *heroic*. Is it not an opinion, hitherto unavowed, that timidity, respecting the welfare of your country, is virtuous, which it is the indispensable duty of every subject to promote and to defend, a welfare which exceeds that of person in degree, as millions are
more

more in number than an individual ; a welfare which can never be deserted by a minister but through a flagitious insensibility of honour ; a renunciation of every claim to fortitude ; a dereliction of his duty to exert that executive power with which he is entrusted ! all which disgrace the very being of humanity : and yet a timidity which includes all these your orator hath dared to dignify with the name of *heroic virtue*.

On this opinion of heroic and virtuous timidity, so irreconcilable with every conception of magnanimity, it was, that this secretary and his master founded their conduct, respecting the welfare of your country in repealing the stamp act. And this he verifies, by avowing, “ the noble lord who
“ then conducted affairs, and his worthy colleagues,
“ whilst they *trembled* at the prospect of such distresses as the Commons and ministry have since
“ brought upon themselves, were not *afraid* steadily to look in the face that glaring and dazzling
“ influence, at which the eyes of eagles have
“ *blenched*.”

I will first examine the state of affairs in America, in order to explain whether the *trembling* of this noble lord and his colleagues, so perfectly *worthy* of being conjoined with him, and which produced the repeal of the stamp act, be an *heroic* virtue. And then I will examine that fortitude, “ with which they looked in the face, that dazzling influence at which the eyes of eagles have *blenched*.” To this intent, I shall select the words of this speaker, as those which can best protect me from the charges of prejudice and partiality, in describing the conduct of the Americans at that time. You have already heard from *him*, “ that *insurrections* were *universal* ; the *stamp papers* seized
and

and *burned* ; the *officers forced to resign* their commissions under the *gallows* ; the *houses of the magistrates risted and pulled down*, and all who dared to *write and speak* in defence of the powers of parliament, *expelled their country*.”

To these he adds, “ when the accounts of the
 “ American governors came before the house,
 “ they appeared stronger even than the warmth
 “ of public imagination had painted them.—
 “ All the late disturbances, which have been,
 “ at one time, the ministers motives for the re-
 “ peal of five out of six of the new court taxes ;
 “ and are now the pretence for refusing to repeal
 “ the sixth, did not amount to——Why do I
 “ compare them? No, not a tenth part of the
 “ tumults and violence which prevailed long be-
 “ fore the repeal of that act.*

The intent to remove Mr. Grenville from administration, together with the others who held the superior offices, took its rise from the injudicious omission of the princess of Wales, in the act for establishing a regency. As this event was sudden, the supplying of their places was attended with some precipitation. The marquis of Rockingham, as it was then said and believed, was reluctantly induced to accept the lead in the Treasury and in administration. The veteran duke of Newcastle, in the place of privy-seal, was appointed dry-nurse ; and Edmund Burke, in the name of private secretary, was made rocker to the young minister.

As foresight is not one of the attributes with which your orator has so splendidly adorned his minister, the approach of the storm from America was

* P. 69. of the speech.

was not discerned. Accordingly, when it was known in this kingdom, the new ministers began to perceive, that their preceding conduct in parliament, had produced much greater disturbance than they expected or desired; now the executive power of the state was fallen into their own hands. In consequence of this event, they became as uneasy as rats in a hot kettle, and as unacquainted by what means to escape from their scalding situation.

Their embarrassments were as great as they were unforeseen. On the part of this kingdom, the sovereign authority stared them full in the face, and demanded to be sustained. On the part of the colonies, those principles and opinions which these ministers, when in opposition, had avowed in parliament; and which had incensed the Americans to those outrages in which they were then engaged, called on them to renounce the parliamentary right, not only of internal, but of all taxation, because the colonists were not represented in the house of commons. Such was the situation of affairs in England, when the Rockingham ministry ascended to power.

As the Americans had extended their objections to *external* equally with *internal* taxation, that circumstance would have afforded the new ministry a favorable opportunity of disentangling themselves from the briars in which they were caught. But it passed unobserved by all the great faculties of the minister and his worthy colleagues. It was evident that by these men the repeal of the stamp-act could not be refused, because it was an *internal* tax, which they had uniformly decried. But the right to *external* taxation should have been supported because they themselves; in opposition, had allowed it to be constitutional. At the same time, to annihilate all cause of contention, respecting the right of parliament

parliament over the Americans, that ministry should have proposed to them the sending of members to the house of commons.

This conduct would have perfectly coincided with their former professions and pretexts, in adopting the cause of the Americans. It would have imparted the face of principle and design in their opposition to the preceding ministry. Had the colonies acquiesced in this proposition of representatives, the grand object of preserving the legislative authority over America had been obtained; and the cause of clamour in America removed. If the colonists had refused to comply with that proposal, that obstinacy would have evinced their intentions of detaching themselves from all parliamentary influence; have justified the proceedings of the minister to sustain the supreme authority of Britain; and have produced one universal resentment of their impudence and injustice in this country. As either one or other of these events must have been the consequence of the preceding conduct, it is manifest they were then so auspiciously circumstanced as to possess the means of escaping from their dreaded difficulties with reputation. But the *sound principles*, the *enlarged mind*, the *sagacious sense* and the *unshaken fortitude* which Mr. Burke saw in his master conducted him by another road, the effects of which shall soon be laid before you.

With a view to obviate the charge of sacrificing the British sovereignty to the rebellion of the colonists, the ministers passed an act declaratory of the legislative right to tax America without *qualification* respecting either the *external* or *internal* mode of laying duties, and then by another they repealed the stamp-act *totally*.*

By

* Speech, p. 66.

By the first they imagined that every imputation of having surrendered the legislative authority to the insolence of the colonists, would be most effectually averted. If the immense talents of that minister be to be decided by this procedure, it evinces he was a novice in the science of human kind. For, instead of effecting what they expected, it proved to demonstration, their *unprincipled* proceedings in opposition to the late ministry; since it contradicted all that they had avowed respecting the *limited* right of parliament to tax America *unrepresented*. It confirmed the opinion that the previous administration had acted justly and constitutionally in obtaining the stamp-act; and that the *then* ministry had opposed them with a consciousness of *their* being wrong in that opposition. And thus they stood as self condemned and despicable culprits, ratified by their own act in parliament.

By this *unqualified* act of the legislature also, the Americans were in fact made rebels against the sovereign authority. For the parliamentary right of enacting the stamp-act being now legislatively declared to be constitutional, the outrages which had been committed in the colonies were consequently determined to be rebellious. This was the first service the new ministers performed for their American favourites, whose cause they had espoused. Thus, as the result of his own proceedings, as well as by the duty of his office, it became an indispensable obligation on the new minister to compel the Americans to an acknowledgement of the British right of legislature, before the stamp-act was repealed; or never to have repealed it. On the contrary, without exerting the least endeavour to obtain the slightest concession from the colonists, that the parliamentary authority was legally exercised in America,

America, they repealed the stamp-act *totally*, and without conditions. And yet by this conduct, did that ministry expect to continue in the enjoyment of power, place, and riches, approved both by Britons and Americans.

But so dissimilar was the event to the expectation; that the people of England beheld this declaratory and *unqualified* act, like the waxen figure of king William, in a glass case, in Westminster-Abbey, decorated with all the trappings and insignia of sovereignty, the ineffective mockery of life and power; a delusion by which their understandings were to be insulted. And thus by the ministerial affectation of ascertaining the parliamentary right by law, and renouncing it in practice by the repeal of the stamp-act, the people were led to consider that repeal, as an act declaratory that they intended virtually to abolish the British sovereignty in America, which they had speciously supported by parliament. Hence a conviction naturally ensued, that the then ministry were regardless of their country's honour; sunk in abject timidity; and attentive solely to their own interests.

On the other hand, the Americans beheld this declaratory and *unqualified* act, sometimes as a scandalous desertion of those principles and arguments which these ministers, when in opposition, had so unreservedly avowed and promised to support. At others they considered it as totally void of all principle, as they had now attempted to establish an authority which they had constantly averred the parliament did not legally possess: and therefore, intending to fix that power which they could not justify, they were resolved to exceed the former, and to act more arbitrarily in their administration. At the same time they

abstained not from deriding the new ministerial idea of establishing a parliamentary right, over America, by that very *parliament* whose authority, these ministers had formerly sustained, and taught them to believe, was inadequate to that right. The repeal of the stamp-act was therefore received as a temporary expedient to reduce *them* to tranquility, whilst the ministerial intrigues were carrying on for permanently fixing the legislative authority in the colonies. By these proceedings, nothing was settled but discontent both in Britain and America.

In this behaviour, the discerning saw no mark either of a sound principle, an enlarged mind, a sagacious sense, or an unshaken fortitude. But they beheld a rich redundancy of the *heroic virtue* of being absolutely *intimidated* from acting with regard to the *welfare* of their *country*. They saw them *virtuously sculking* behind a *majority* in parliament in this kingdom; and *heroically fleeing* before the rebels in America, with that contempt for their understandings, and indignation at their pusillanimity which they deserved.

The whole of this singular transaction was conducted by the self-interested and despicable cunning of a cheesemonger, chosen arbitrator between his two customers, Tom Thimble the taylor, and Ebenezer Slipthumb the woollen-draper. Matthew Maggot, "*because a modification is the constant resource of weak and undeciding minds,*" resolved to *refine* and to preserve his *interest* with both parties. By this policy, he doubted not but still to continue in the emoluments arising from the sale of his old Cheshire and double Gloucester. With vast circumspection, and self-applause, he therefore determined, that Tom *had the right to*
what

what he demanded ; but that Ebenezar should be excused *from* complying *with it*. Tom was displeased, because he thought a right which was not to be exerted, was of no value. Ebenezar, because the right was against him, and altho' it were not now to be exerted, it might be on future occasions. And thus by this refinement in *clear* and *sagacious sense*, Matibew lost both his customers ; fell into disgrace among his neighbours, respecting his intellects and selfishness ; was deserted by his former followers ; became a sufferer in his profits ; and a bankrupt in reputation.

Such was the conduct of that ministry, who were not to be satisfied with "the *bon ton* of the court, a *modification* like the present timid, unsystematic, procrastinating ministry, because a modification is the constant resource of weak undeciding minds." This reflection undoubtedly comes with double *propriety* and *justness* from your orator, and his master, who through *timidity* fled before the Americans in rebellion. Who were *systematically* wrong, by enacting one law and repealing another. Who displeased both sides of the question, and hoped to *procrastinate* the evil day of an open rupture, and their own dismissal, Whereas the present ministry are, and have been with real fortitude *systematically* advancing to subdue that rebellion, which was excited by this orator and his worthy associates.

Such having been their exhibition of the *heroic virtue* of *timidity*, relative to the Americans, I come now to shew the unshaken fortitude of the noble lord and his worthy colleagues, "who were not afraid to look in the face that glaring and dazzling influence at which the eyes of eagles have blenched." And what do you imagine

this *dazzling influence* was, at which the *more than eagle-eyed ministry* did *not* blench? it was "the *face*" of one of the ablest, and let him say, not the "most scrupulous oppositions that ever was in that house, and withstood it, unaided even by one of the usual supports of administration." Oh what an act of heroism was here. Let no man henceforth mention Leonidas, against the Persians, at the straits of Thermopylæ!

By being unsupported by *one* of the usual *supports*, I imagine he must mean that *one* called a *sound judgement*. For is there a man so ignorant or so credulous as to believe they were not backed by all those other supports of power, place, and money, that obtained all other majorities? How unshaken in more than eagle-eyed fortitude was this minister? he looked *unblenching* in the face of opposition, against which had he been accompanied with two hundred and eighty dwarfs in understanding, strength and courage, provided they possessed the dangerless intrepidity of saying *Aye*, he must inevitably have overcome two hundred and seventy eight opponents, although each of them had been a giant in all the preceding faculties of soul and body. An act so singularly heroic, that none but an orator so singularly possessed of all the powers of rhetoric, could have executed the task of being his adequate panegyrist. An orator, who more than *eagle-eyed* so gloriously fought with his colleagues in this dazzling battle; after they had fled from rebels to their country, without daring to offer the least opposition. And this, *like* Demosthenes in running away only, he would persuade you was a deed of unshaken fortitude.

But of what action will he leave the justification unattempted, who says that the minister in this conquest

conquest in the house of commons, "was unaided by even *one of the usual supports of administration.*"

Not a man of the treasury, admiralty, trade, and plantation boards, not a placeman, pensioner, nor officer civil or military, voted in the repeal of this bill; none but disinterested and independent members. This he had the confidence to speak in the face of hundreds, conscious, both *he* and *they*, that it was untrue. This he has the confidence to publish to you who are in like manner convinced of this untruth. This too I suppose he will deem an act of unshaken fortitude. It is indeed an act that may justly create astonishment, at least, in any man except this orator.

But the fortitude of the minister was exercised in a yet more courageous manner. "He looked in the face a person he had long respected and regarded, and whose *aid* was then particularly wanted: he means lord Chatham. He did this when he passed the declaratory act." From this passage, it is evident that this speaker considers the lord, just mentioned, as a more formidable opponent than all the opposition of the other commons. But whence did it arise that this minister of such enlargement of mind, such clear and sagacious sense, should want the assistance of that lord? was the looking him in the face an act of unshaken fortitude, when he had no other way to look? and yet you shall find, from the words of this very speaker, that no man could in fact be less formidable, than this lord; if his pourtraiture of him be just.

"It is now given out," says your orator, "for the usual purposes, that lord Rockingham did not consent to the repeal of the stamp act, until he was bullied into it by lord Chatham;

“ and the reporters have gone so far, as publicly
 “ to assert, in an hundred companies, that ge-
 “ neral Conway, who proposed the repeal in the
 “ American committee, had another set of re-
 “ solutions in his pocket, directly the reverse of
 “ those he moved. These artifices of a desperate
 “ cause are, at this time, spread abroad with in-
 “ credible care, as if the industry of the circula-
 “ tion were to make amends for the absurdity of
 “ of the report.” And then, as a refutation of
 this absurdity, he says, “ whether the noble lord
 “ is of a complexion to be bullied by lord Chat-
 “ ham, or by any man, I must submit to those who
 “ know him,” with which I acquiesce. And thus
 this charge of timidity, so absurd and so industriously
 propagated in conversation, is now *propagated* in
 print, and left without a refutation ; and you hear
 no more of the second set of resolutions in general
 Conway’s pocket. Does not this evasion of an-
 swer appear to be adopted, because the assertions
 cannot be disproved ?

It is pleasant to see, with what aggravation of
 magnanimity, this speaker represents lord Rock-
 ingham on this occasion. “ I confess, when I
 “ look back to that time,” says he, “ I consider
 “ him as placed in one of the most trying situati-
 “ ons in which, perhaps, any man ever stood ? in
 “ the house of peers, there were very few of the
 “ ministry, out of the noble lord’s particular con-
 “ nexion, (except lord Egmont, who acted, as
 “ far as he could discern, an honourable part) that
 “ did not look to some other future arrangement,
 “ which warped his politics.” This trying situati-
 on I have already explained, and he informs you,^o
 left

^o Speech, p. 65.

left you should believe him, "they had powerful
 " friends, the means of fighting a great battle, and
 " of gaining the victory," which was certainly *as try-*
ing a situation as ever man did stand in. But these
 lords, whose honour he presumes so egregiously to
 traduce, did nevertheless vote with the noble lord.
 They did indeed, as he says, look to some future
 arrangement, which *did not warp their politics,*
 but confirmed their judgement, that the noble
 lord's time of administration was expiring. "There
 " were, in truth, in both houses, new and me-
 " nacing appearances that might very naturally
 " drive any other than a most resolute minister
 " from his measure, or from his station." I have
 already spoken sufficiently of his *resolution.* His
 measure he was permitted to carry to his ruin as
 a minister; for in consequence of that measure, he
 soon lost his station. "The household troops
 " openly revolted; the allies of the ministry (who
 " refused responsibility for any) endeavoured to
 " undermine their credit, and took ground that
 " must be fatal to the success of the very cause
 " which they would be thought to countenance."
 In what a pitiful state of desertion does he place
 that minister, whom he intends to laud and mag-
 nify; and to whom he is indebted for the means
 of all that importance which he so superciliously
 assumes. Is it not a judicious method of support-
 ing the character he was delineating for posterity;
 to represent both houses of parliament surveying
 him as a man, who by statute declaring the right
 of parliament to tax the Americans, first makes
 them rebels; and then by another, dismisses them
 unacknowledging the offence, with the gratification
 of their demands? Who deserts the executive
 power of the state, and offers up the supreme au-

thority of the realm to timidity, and the groundless expectation of preserving his post, which they saw to be impossible. Sir John Falstaffe values himself for his knowing the true prince by the instinct of a lion. Both houses discovered the minister by a very different kind of instinct. It was that of *rats*, which always desert a falling house.

“ The question of the repeal was brought on by
 “ ministry, in the very instant when it was known
 “ that more than one court negotiation was carry-
 “ ing on with the heads of the opposition.” And
 at that instant it was too late for the minister to re-
 cede. “ Every thing, on every side, was full of
 “ traps and mines,” and those for whom they
 were intended, were either caught in the former,
 or were blown up by the latter. But it was not
 the two houses, and the court alone, which
 discerned the mischief he was bringing on his
 country. “ Earth below shook; heaven above
 “ menaced, all the elements of ministerial safety
 “ were dissolved.” But to what intent was all this
 convulsion? It was, that earth expressed her
 disapprobation of his proceeding; the heavens
 menaced him with their wrath; and what is more
 than all, *indissoluble* things, even *elements*, were *dissolved*: and thus he stood perilously disapproved
 by heaven, earth, and man. I confess indeed that
 this is the first time I ever heard that heaven and
 earth, or any thing else, could be *elements* of mini-
 sterial safety. Does he mean by these *elements*,
 that there was *no* more *money* in the *Treasury*, and
 that therefore they were dissolved?

“ It was in the midst of this *chaos* of plots and
 counterplots,” heaven, earth, and man, plotting
 and counterplotting against a minister, whom they
 saw to need no other plots nor counterplots than
 his

his own *sound principle, enlarged mind, sagacious sense, and unshaken fortitude*, assisted by those of his secretary, to bring upon him inevitable ruin. However, "it was in the midst of this complicated warfare, against public opposition and private treachery, that the firmness of that noble person was put to the proof. He never stirred from his ground; no, not an inch." He was sure of a majority in this repeal: on the accomplishment of which the general desertion of all around him took place. And with respect to his firmness, *of not stirring an inch*, it is evident, he had *not* an inch to stir; unless he had practised that heroic timidity of yielding before the opposition, without one verbal contest, as he did before the rebellious Americans. "He remained fixed and determined in principle, in measure, and in conduct." How fatal these have proved to this country, has been already shewn, and shall be farther elucidated. "He practised no managements." Is it not manifest, that he knew nothing of management? "He secured no retreat." There was no man opposed his going off. "He sought no apology." He left that to his secretary, and it is executed as the cause deserves.

"I will likewise do justice," he adds, "I ought to do it, to general Conway; far from the duplicity, wickedly charged on him, he acted his part with alacrity and resolution." Whether he acted with duplicity or not, I have neither grounds on which to determine, nor inclination to charge him with such behaviour. But of this I am sure, I should request every friend, who intended to be my advocate against double-dealing, to use better arguments in disproof of it, "than acting with alacrity and resolution." For these are as
equally

equally reconcilable with duplicity as with the most simple deed that can be transacted.

“ We all felt inspired by the example he gave us, down even to myself,” says he, “ the weakest in the phalanx.” Who now *uninspired* assumes an importance, that would have been ridiculous in the strongest. “ I declare for me,” he adds, “ I knew well enough.” But how ? He tells you, “ it could not be concealed from any body, the true state of things ; but in my life,” he adds, “ I never came with so much spirits into the house. It was a time for a man to act in.” And now he discovers the true state of things. “ We had powerful enemies ; but we had faithful and determined friends, and a glorious cause. We had a great battle to fight, but we had the means of fighting ; not as now, when our hands are tied behind us. We did fight that day and conquer.” Such was the state of things, and it was really a true time for a *man* to act in, who knew he was sure of victory before he engaged. And hence it appears, that all the formidable description which he has just given, of dishonourable and unmanly lords ; of the household troops revolting ; of treacherous associates ; of earth below that trembled, and heaven above that menaced ; of chaotic plots and counterplots ; and of the unshaken fortitude of the minister that condemned them all, had no existence. The minister and his colleagues entered on this battle with the unconquerable phalanx of a known majority ; which gave such *spirits* to this orator, and proves, that those, whom he would describe as *deserters*, did adhere to his master. Or by what possible means could the majority have been obtained ? But now, alas ! “ *their arms are tied behind them.*”

them." Happy had it been, for this nation, had they been bound on that day! happy it is they still remain in bondage. We shall now behold the supreme legislative power; the dignity of the king; and the authority of the laws restored and supported in America; Rebellion subdued; and one general execration will be heard of all those, who by delusive arguments, have excited them to oppose that sovereignty which they were born to obey; and which it was at once their duty and their interest to acknowledge and preserve.

He continues. " I remember with a melancholy pleasure," the situation of Mr. Conway, who made the motion for the repeal, " when the whole trading interest of this empire, crammed into your lobbies, with a trembling and anxious expectation, waited almost to a winter's return of light, their fate from your resolutions." I shall immediately attempt to assign the cause of this present *melancholy*, on remembering the past *pleasure*. But is the whole trading interest of this empire susceptible of being crammed into the lobbies of the house of Commons? Surely they were either *miraculously* enlarged on that great day, or are *hyperbolically* so in this speech. But in reality was there a merchant present, except the American, in whom all consideration for the dignity and rights of his country were superseded by private interest? It is reasonable enough to believe indeed, that their trembling anxiety and expectations were great. Since, according to the words of this orator, they had been crammed into the lobbies almost all the *spring*, *summer*, and *autumn*, waiting for the *winter's return of light*, to know their fate.

It was no wonder therefore, that being so long crammed together, like herrings in a barrel, when “ the figure of their deliverer was shewn them, “ in the well-earned triumph of his important victory in their favour, that from the whole of that “ grave multitude, there arose an *involuntary* burst “ of gratitude and transport.” What new kind of *gratitude* must this be, which rises *against the will* of him who shews it ? By what obligation was their deliverer bound by such an *applausive gratitude* as they could not *abstain from giving him* ? But this accurate speaker contains an inexhaustible mine of new and wonderful discoveries, in the science of human nature.

“ They jumped upon the general like children on “ a long absent father.” I hope they did *that also involuntarily*. Otherwise, the whole trading interest of this empire, jumping on a man’s back, seems to be a weight that few will consider as very expressive of good-will. “ They clung about him “ as captives about their redeemer.” They certainly thought he had redeemed the money from *captivity* that was owing them from America. “ All England, all America, joined in his *applause*.” I apprehend here is some mistake, at least, respecting *all England*.

He then says of Mr. Conway : “ *Hope elevated, “ and joy brightened his crest*. That he stood near “ him, and that his face was as if it had been the “ face of an *angel*,” concerning which similitude, as I have never seen either an angel or Mr. Conway, I have nothing to say. “ I do not know,” says he, “ how “ others feel, but if I had stood in that situation, “ I never would have exchanged it for all that “ kings, in their profusion could bestow.” What will you conceive of that man, whose virtue would
have

have thus exulted, had he been the leader in that debate, which ended in the flagitious immolation of the British sovereignty to American rebellion ?

But Mr. Conway has not persevered in that sentiment, as you are told by the orator. “ I did “ hope,” says he, “ that that day’s danger would “ have been a bond to hold us together for ever. “ But alas ! that, with other pleasing visions, is “ long since vanished.” Is it not hence that *melancholy* springs which attends the *remembrance* of that day’s *pleasure* ? His place, and all his visions of approaching greatness, even his hopes, are vanished. This is indeed a circumstance that may naturally depress a stout heart with *melancholy*.

He then says, of that ministry, “ they differed “ fundamentally from the scheme of both parties, “ but they preserved the object of both.” Is there not something incomprehensible in this, that a ministry should *fundamentally* differ from two schemes of others, and yet *preserve the objects* of *both* ? Is not the obtaining of the *end*, the *fundamental object* of all schemes ? How then do these schemes differ ? “ They preserved the “ *authority* of Great Britain ; they preserved the “ *equity* ; they made the declaratory act ; they repealed the stamp act. They did both *fully*, because the declaratory act was *without qualification*, “ and the repeal of the stamp act *total*.” The excellence of this *fundamental* difference in schemes, from that of all other ministers, I have already exposed to your view, respecting the *authority* of Great Britain. I will now shew you in what manner they preserved her *equity*.

Is it not inseparable from every idea of national *equity*, that the same *authority* should prevail through all dominions of the *same* sovereign ? That all his
sub-

subjects should be as *equally* taxed, in support of the general welfare, as the nature of their circumstances can bear? And that you, the people of England, should not be more than proportionably oppressed in such taxations? Are not these the indisputable characteristics of *national equity*? And yet these preservers of British *equity*, suspended the executive power of parliament over the Americans; relieved them from taxes raised for their own support alone; and left you oppressed by enormous debts contracted in their defence, and exposed to the like oppression for the future. Such were their means of *preserving* the *equity* of Britain. Are these marks of those *sound principles*, that *enlargement of mind*, that *clear and sagacious sense*, that *unshaken fortitude*, which this orator did see in that noble lord and minister? Are the justification of such a cause, the fallacy of such arguments, and the confidence of this speaker, such signs as can create belief; that he saw those exalted qualities in his master? Do these means express either a knowledge of *national equity*, or a desire of *preserving* it?

I have given him my opinion, and my reasons in support of it. Perhaps that may prove a sufficient answer, "if the principle of the declaratory act" was not good; he adds, the principle we are contending for this day is monstrous." If, by this principle, he means the support of parliamentary authority then is it good; and so also is that principle, for which the ministry are contending, for both are the same. But should this question be asked him, since the principle, the right of the sovereign authority pronounced in the declaratory act is good, why did you renounce the ex-
 ortion

ertion of it in favour of rebellion, what *would the adversary say to that?*

“ If the principle of the repeal was not good, says he, why are we not at war for a real substantial effective revenue?” are they not preparing by arms to obtain that end, if milder means cannot prevail; and for another inexpressibly more important, the restoration of the exercise of that *principle* which, by the repeal of the stamp-act, was all but annihilated. By which act, the *principle* on which it was *perpetrated* appears to be the most ignominiously degrading of national honour; and egregiously exhibitiv of broken confidence in the executive power, that can be found on record.

“ If both were bad, why has this ministry incurred all the incumbrances of both and of all schemes? why have they enacted, repealed, enforced, yielded, and now attempt to enforce again?” that both were bad arose from their being managed by this orator and his master. But that this charge on the present ministry, of enacting and repealing, has no ground, I have repeatedly proved.

“ I think, says he, I may as well now, as at any other time, speak to a certain matter of fact, not wholly unrelated to the question under your consideration.” To the full as well now as at any time, it is “that the court leaders have given out to all their corps this cant against him, and all those who would prevent the ministry from the frantic war, is that all the disturbances in America have been created by the repeal of the stamp-act. I suppress, says he, for a moment, my indignation at the falsehood, baseness, and absurdity of this most audacious assertion.” I will venture to affirm that no minister ever declared himself

himself of that opinion. They not only know and declare that the fact was otherwise ; but that the first rebellion of the Americans proceeded from the speeches of *that* ministry, when in opposition; that their pusillanimous flight, before those rebels strengthened their resolution of exciting disturbances in America ; and that repealing of the stamp-act confirmed them in their pursuits. Such are the known sentiments and declaration not only of courtiers, but of all men who can reflect and be honest in their speech. But it seems this man of mighty words, stung with *indignation*, but *suppressed*, at so false, base, absurd, and audacious an assertion, rises in refutation of the repeal of the stamp-act as being the cause of these American disturbances. And thereby he robs his master of the means of exculpation, which are offered from an inability of foreseeing, that such disturbances would be the issue of that repeal. And thus he cunningly sends you back to proofs that cannot but evince that those disturbances sprang from previous opinions delivered by them in parliament. Such is the amazing ingenuity of this orator, in confuting the reports of his opponents, and in confirming his master's innocence.

Let but this low cant, insufferable as it is to his *sense of honour*, his *love of truth*, his *aversion* from *absurdity*, and his *horror* at *audaciousness*, be written as it was delivered, even by those who have spoken it without authority, and it becomes indisputable *truth*. "All the *present* disturbances in America have been created by the repeal of the stamp-act." Is there a man of common sense now living that is not fully persuaded, that had Mr. Grenville remained minister to this day, that the legislative authority of Britain had been fully established in America,

America, by persevering in the support of the stamp-act? has not the repeal, therefore, by the Rockingham ministry been the *certain cause* of the present disturbances? their harangues in parliament had caused those disturbances which frightened themselves into that repeal. And that act of timidity necessarily produced the subsequent, acts to restore the British sovereignty which caused the *present* disturbances. For once, therefore, I coincide with this orator; that there were disturbances in America before the abrogation of the stamp act; and yet I assert the *present* were caused by the repeal of that act.

Such being the issue of his indignation, *suppressed* in the charges of *falsehood, baseness, absurdity, and audacious assertion*, he virulently proceeds. "This
 " vermin of court reporters, when they are forced
 " into day, upon one point, are sure to burrow
 " in another:" what a happy preservation is visible in all his metaphors." Do vermin *burrow* in a *point*, and are they forced *upon* the *point* in which they have *burrowed*? however, "they shall have
 " no refuge, he will make them bolt out of their
 " holes." And thus the *points* are become *holes*.
 " Conscious, says he, that they must be baffled,
 " when they attribute a precedent disturbance to a
 " subsequent measure, they take other ground almost as absurd, but very common in modern
 " practice, and very wicked; which is to attribute
 " the ill effect of ill judged conduct, to the arguments which had been used to dissuade us
 " from it. They say that the opposition made in
 " parliament to the stamp-act at the time of its
 " passing, encouraged the Americans to their resistance. This, says he, a Dr. Tucker has declared in print. But this assertion too, just like
 N " the

“ the rest, is false.” It is indeed as *exactly false* as the rest. I leave the dean and the orator to settle which of them is to be believed. And I appeal to evidence, infinitely more unexceptionable than that of both of them, for the truth of that assertion which this speaker pronounces to be false.

I have already shewn you, from governor Bernard’s letters, what were the opinions which the Americans adopted and pursued on being informed of what passed in the commons, respecting representation in parliament and internal taxation. Altho’ that be sufficient proof of the preceding fact, yet I will recur to a letter which hath been already quoted, dated Jan. 28, 1768. He says, “ it was easy to be foreseen that the *distinctions* used in parliament in favour of the Americans would be adopted by them, and received as fundamental laws. It would signify nothing by *what number* these distinctions were *rejected*; the respectableness of the names of the promoters of them, and the apparent interest of the Americans in maintaining them, would outweigh all authority of numbers for the contrary opinion. It was also to be foreseen, that the Americans would carry these distinctions much further than the promoters could possibly intend they should be.” Will this orator now persist in the face of this testimony, that it is a *false assertion*, that the opposition in parliament to the stamp-act, at the time of its passing, encouraged the Americans to their resistance? all his appeal to papers on the table and to witnesses produced in the house, and their silence on this head, weigh not a grain in opposition to the preceding letter which fully and irrefragably evinces that truth, which the orator so peremptorily denies. It refutes also what he says, when “ sitting
a stranger

a stranger in the gallery, when the act was under consideration, that, as he remembers, not more than two or three members spoke against the act."

"The agents and distributors of falsehoods," he asserts, "have, with their usual industry, circulated another lye of the same nature with the former." Which *lye*, to borrow a *mode* of speaking, natural and familiar to this orator, will be proved to be of the *nature of truth*. Let us examine it. "It is, that the disturbances arose from the account which had been received in America of the change in the ministry. No longer awed, it seems, with the spirit of the former rulers, they thought themselves a match, for what *our* calumniators choose to qualify by the name of so feeble a ministry as succeeded." That these three accounts should be propagated by the present ministry, can never find admission, but in the head of ignorance itself. The first report, "that all the disturbances in America, were created by the repeal of the stamp act," is overturned by the second, "that the *opposition* made in parliament, at the time of *passing* that act, was the *cause* of these disturbances:" *this* again was *overthrown* by the *report*, "that the *change* of ministry was the *cause* of these disturbances." Can it be credited, that ministers have set up these different and contradictory *reports* as men do ninepins, which, on one of them being struck, it tumbles down the rest. These reports are such as have been issued by the unthinking populace; and gathered like bits of old iron and farthings, by one who scratches in the dirt, and collects into an old hat, indiscriminately, all that he can find, that will turn to any account.

In this charge of falshood, place but the name of *hope*, instead of *disturbances*, and all is right. For certainly their *hopes* of success did arise, and their endeavours grow stronger, on that change of ministry.

In this passage the orator exalts himself, into the rank of a minister. He says, "for what *our* calumniators choose to qualify by the name of a feeble *ministry*." Does the word *calumniator* come with strict propriety from Mr. Burke? I remember a town in the west of England, where the pig-driver, being appointed by the mayor, did always consider himself as *one* of the corporation. On this conception of his being exalted to that dignity, whenever he cried the pigs in the pound, he invariably concluded with, God bless *Mr. Mayor* and the *rest* of *our* corporation.

"Feeble in one sense," he acknowledges, "these men may certainly be called." And from what has been proved, are they not feeble in every sense? "For," he continues, "with all their efforts, and they have made many, they have not been able to resist the distempered vigour, and insane alacrity, with which the parliament are rushing to their ruin." I shall presume to give another reading to the latter part of this passage: and leave it to your decision on which side the truth is to be found! "They have *not* been able to *continue* the distempered vigour, and insane alacrity, with which they were rushing to *your* ruin." "Thus," says he, "are blown away all the *insect* race of country falshoods; thus perish the miserable *inventions* of the wretched *runners* for a wretched cause, which they have *fly-blown* into every weak and *rotten* part of the country, in vain hopes that when their *maggots* had taken *wing*, their

their importunate *buzzing* might sound something like the *public voice* !” What an admirable display of fertile invention, and of marvellous revelation in the animal creation is here afforded ! An *insect race* of *saltpetres* turn *runners*, these *runners fly-blow intentions* into a *rotten country*, which *intentions* become *winged maggots*, which *winged maggots buzz* like the *voice* of a *whole people*. Oh ! what a discovery is here of a *transformation*, utterly unknown to all the philosophical societies of the universe. Thus, like a sky rocket, from an artificial fire that urges him below, he mounts into the air, bounces, crackles, sparkles, in a diversity of colours, and then, by his natural ponderosity, tumbles headlong into the vast *profund*.

He continues : “ I have troubled you sufficiently “ with the state of America before the repeal,” of which one part was *after before* the repeal ; “ that of the disturbances, which were caused by the *repeal*.” I will dispute no man’s right of *inheritance*. “ And now,” says he, “ I turn to “ Mr. Cornwall, who so stoutly challenges us to “ tell, whether, after the repeal, the provinces “ were quiet ? This is coming home to the point. “ Here I meet him directly ; and answer him di- “ rectly, *they were quiet*. And I in my turn, chal- “ lenge him to prove when, and where, and by “ whom, and in what numbers, and with what “ violence, the other laws of trade, as gentlemen “ assert, were violated in consequence of your con- “ cession, or that even your other revenue laws “ were attacked ? But I quit the vantage ground “ on which I stand, and where I might leave the “ burthen of the proof upon him. I walk down “ upon the open plain, and undertake to shew, “ that they were not only quiet, but shewed many

“ unequivocal marks of acknowledgement and
 “ gratitude. And to give him every advantage,
 “ I select the obnoxious colony of Massachusetts
 “ Bay.” What a generous condescension is this
 to Mr. Cornwall, from so great an orator !

And now you shall see his proofs of this tranquility, after the repeal. The assembly, in their address to governor Bernard, tell him, “ if it is not
 “ now in our power, in so full a manner as will be
 “ expected, to shew our respectful gratitude to the
 “ mother country, or to make a dutiful and affectionate return to the indulgence of the king and
 “ parliament, it shall be no fault of ours ; for this
 “ we intend, and hope we shall be able fully to
 “ effect.”

Did there ever exist an orator who more effectually defeated the cause he undertook to support ? What was the cause that “ put it out of their power fully to shew their respectful gratitude to their mother country ; or to make a dutiful and affectionate return to the king and parliament, at that time ? ” Was it not the disturbances of the people, which still continuing, intimidate them from those acts of duty ? The very evidence he brings *unequivocally* disproves the fact which he undertakes to support. In confirmation of this truth, I refer you to the letters of governor Bernard, of Feb. 28th, 1766, and Jan. 20th, 1768, already inserted in this answer, p. 14 and 15. In which it is said, “ the stamp-act is become a matter of indifference. The people have felt their strength, and will not submit readily to any thing they do not like.” This was the state of things in the colonies before the repeal. After it, the same governor declares, “ when the *imperial* state has so far given way, in the repeal of the stamp-act, as to let the *dependent* states

states flatter themselves, that their pretensions are admissible, whatever terms of reconciliation time, accident, or design, *may* produce, if they are deficient in settling the true relation of *Great Britain* to her *colonies*; and ascertaining the bounds of the *sovereignty* of one, and the *dependence* of the other, conciliation will be no more than suspension of hostilities." Hence it is clear, that their hostilities were *not* then suspended; and that the repeal of the stamp-act, by its fugitive timidity, had been the cause of their continuance. For rebels are constantly flattered by such concessions to persevere in their treason.

What a stinging reprehension does governor Bernard give that ministry, who thus afforded to the Americans, by the repeal, that cause of flattering themselves, that their pretensions were admissible? But it was not in that mistake alone they excited them to expect the whole of what they required. In his letter, Sept. 20th, 1768, when some hints were given by the *present* ministry, that his conduct should be more spirited, he says, "in this spirited conduct I
 " persisted, till I found it did not agree with the
 " system at home, which required lenient measures
 " and soft speeches, to bring about conciliation
 " without correction. I knew that this would *not*
 " do with the people I had to deal with; but I
 " could not dispute about it." This change of conduct was occasioned by orders, from the Rockingham ministry, to be conciliatory and lenient. And if fame be to be relied on, these smooth speeches were to consist of intreaties, that the Americans would be content with the abolition of the stamp-act at that time; and with assurances, that the legislative authority was then suspended with full design to prepare the way for absolutely re-

seinding it at another. And that the declaratory act had no farther meaning than to silence their opponents in parliament, who would otherwise have pronounced them to have sacrificed the dignity of the kingdom, in order to preserve themselves in place, power, and accumulation of riches. Who are now the mumpers, that with a fore leg implored the provinces to be quiet? Where was the remembrance of this ignominious act, when this orator calumniated the present ministry with that *mumping* meanness which they never committed? And now, having restored the *fore leg* to its proper *body*, I leave him to cure it as he may.

He now proceeds to ascertain the quietness of the province of the Massachusetts, and adds, "on the requisition for compensation to those who had suffered from the violence of the populace, in the same addie's they say, the recommendation enjoined by Mr. secretary Conway's letter, and in consequence thereof made to us, we will embrace the first opportunity to consider and act upon." With what egregious indignities did this ministry disgrace the executive power of the British legislature! They not only sneaked from before the rebels, but condescended to make a requisition, for a compensation of the violences they had committed; and thereby renounced that right of legally obtaining it, which the laws have bestowed on every British subject. Were all things quiet at that time in that province? Notwithstanding this answer, so evasive of the requisition, the orator pronounces, "they did consider, they did act upon it, they obeyed the requisition; it was substantially obeyed. The damages of popular fury were *compensated by legislative gravity*."

"*vity*." Ah! what a compensation was here? Did legislative gravity compensate for universal insurrections? No. Did it compensate for the violence of seizing and burning the stamped papers? No. Did it compensate for the outrage of forcing officers to resign their commissions under the gallows? No. Did it compensate for pulling down and rifling the houses of magistrates? No. Did it compensate for the expulsion from their country of all those who dared to speak or write a single word in defence of the power of parliament? No. For what did it then make compensation? For *nothing*. Surely so ridiculous an assertion was never seriously uttered by human lips before this time! Sir John Falstaff, jocularly indeed, makes a defence, which in its import, is not unlike it. When the prince says to the knight, "firrah, do I owe you a thousand pounds?" he replies, "A thousand pounds, Hal! thy love is worth a *million*; thou owest me thy love." In this manner you must estimate the *legislative gravity* of the Americans, or the *injured* have gone *without* compensation.

To this unexampled stroke of proving what he had asserted, he adds, "I am bold to say, that to sudden a calm, recovered after so violent a storm, is without parallel in history." After his boldness in saying the former, what may we not expect from such boldness? As to the *calm*, if there were any, it must have been *during* the *storm*. For it has been already proved, that the storm did never subside. An assertion of that kind would be nothing unusual in that orator, who has represented things past and present, and even impossibilities, to have existed together.

" And

“ And now,” says he, “ I hope the gentleman has received a fair and full answer to his questions.” And I, in my turn, hope the speaker has received a fair and full refutation of his assertions. Which of us hath succeeded in his endeavour, I resign to your determination.

“ I have done,” says he, “ with the third period of your policy, that of the repeal, and the return of the ancient system, and ancient tranquillity and concord.” To the policy of the repeal, and the return of tranquillity, I shall say no more. “ This period,” adds he, “ was not so long as it was happy.” Short as it was, it was longer than it was happy. For it is evident, that happiness it had none. Or there is no evidence in facts. In reality, the manifestations of impotence, were so conspicuous in this ministry; the necessity of more able heads so urgent; and the derision of their conduct so universal; that they rather walked out of power, from a consciousness of insufficiency to discharge their duty, than were dismissed from administration.

He now informs you, “ the state,” *not* in the condition he has described it, “ was delivered into the hands of Lord Chatham, a great and celebrated name; a name that keeps the name of this country respectable in every other on the globe.” It may be called,

— clarum et venerabile nomen

Gentibus, et multum nostræ quod proderat urbi.

Which being interpreted, may signify, a name famous and venerable in all other nations, and which hath cost his country seventy millions of money.

“ The

“ The venerable age of this great man, his
 “ merited rank, his superior eloquence, his splen-
 “ did qualities, his eminent services, the vast space
 “ he fills in the eye of mankind ; and more than
 “ all the rest, his fall from power, which, like
 “ death, canonizes and sanctifies a great character,
 “ will not suffer me to *censure* any part of his con-
 “ duct ; I am afraid to flatter him ; I am sure
 “ I am not *disposed* to *blame* him.”

Till now I never heard, that any man could be canonized by a *fall*, before he was dead ; nor that *death* hath ever canonized a character. Is death a pope ?

Let us examine how faithfully he observes his promises. He continues : “ For a wise man, he
 “ seemed to me to be governed too much by ge-
 “ neral maxims. One or two of these maxims,
 “ flowing from an *opinion* not the most *indulgent*
 “ to our *unhappy species*, and surely a little too
 “ general, led him into *measures* that were greatly
 “ *mischievous* to himself, and for that reason,
 “ among others, perhaps *fatal* to his *country* ;
 “ measures the effect of which I am afraid, are
 “ *for ever incurable*. He made an administration
 “ so checquered and speckled ; he put together a
 “ piece of joinery so crossly indented, and whim-
 “ sically dove-tailed ; a cabinet so variously ir-
 “ such a piece of diversified mosaic, such a tes-
 “ selated pavement without cement ; here a bit of
 “ black stone, and there a bit of white.” And
 thus this great man, with all the eminent qualities
 which this orator hath, in the preceding instant,
 ascribed to him, is *now* reduced to be the
 most ridiculous compound that hath ever existed.
 He is a *maker of checquer tables*, a *speckler*, a *clumsy*
joiner, a *cabinet maker*, a *worker in mosaic*, and a
paviour.

pariour. Qualities which must inevitably have made his name respectable, as a statesman, through all the nations of the globe.

But they were not *black and white stones* only, that he put into this pavement, “patriots and
“courtiers, kings friends and republicans, whigs
“and tories, treacherous friends, and open ene-
“mies were inserted also, so that it was indeed a
“very curious show, but unsafe to touch, and
“unsafe to stand on.” Why it should be unsafe to *touch* is past my comprehension, although I agree it might be too slippery to stand on.

Such is this orator’s happy mode of exemplifying the splendid qualities and eminent services of this great minister, who is canonized before his death; and of *his own* indisposition to blame him. “The colleagues whom he had assembled at the
“same board, stared at each other, and were obliged to ask, *Sir, your name?* *Sir, you have the
“advantage of me. — Mr. such a one. — I beg a
“thousand pardons.*” What a vein of inimitable humour runs through this description! with what amazing propriety does it delineate the manners of such men! what a world of verisimilitude it bears!

“I venture to say,” says he, indeed he is in all shapes an *adventurer*, “it did so happen, that persons had a single office divided between them,
“who had never spoke to each other in their lives,
“until they found themselves, they knew not
“how, pigging together, heads and points, in
“the same truckle-bed.”* These persons are explained to be lord North and Mr. Cooke, who were
joint

* Imitated from the 5th chapter of the *Pathos*. of the true genius for the profound.

joint paymasters. The *elegance* of this passage is only equalled by the *pleasantry* of the preceding. It seems these gentlemen were two *pins* with *heads* and *points*, and these *pins* *pigged* together in the same office, and that office was a *truckle bed*. If then, in this high office, *they* *pigged* in a truckle bed, must not lord Rockingham's *clerk*, to preserve a proper subordination in ministerial *pigging*, have *pigged under* a truckle bed?

He now proceeds to give such a description of lord Chatham's ministry, that would stamp on him the most indelible mark of want of common sense that ever disgraced a man, and at the conclusion of it he tells you, "the most artful and most powerful
 " of the set easily prevailed so as to seize upon the
 " vacant, unoccupied, and derelict minds of his
 " friends, and instantly they turned the vessel
 " wholly out of the course of his policy, as if it
 " were to insult as well as to betray him, even
 " long before the close of the first session of his
 " administration, when every thing was publicly
 " transacted, and with great parade in his name,
 " they made an act, declaring it highly just and
 " expedient to raise a revenue in America."

By introducing the mention of this act to raise a revenue in America, the true motive of reducing lord Chatham to that state of mental weakness, in thus suffering the *tricks*, *treachery*, and *impositions* of the other ministers is disclosed. This act during his administration evinces this truth; that he then disapproved of the Rockingham repeal of the stamp-act, and of hanging up the sovereignty of England without life and motion. To obviate that oblique reprehension of lord Chatham, the orator with a spirit of ingenuouſness and veracity becoming

coming his cause, hath thus traduced the character of that nobleman.

He then subjoins "even before this splendid orb was entirely set, and while the western horizon was in a blaze with his descending glory, on the opposite quarter of the heavens arose another luminary, and for his hour became lord of the ascendant." In this manner he has described the splendour and glory of that descending nobleman whom he had before in fact delineated as void of common understanding. In this he resembles the profligacy of a son who having stripped his father of all his possessions, and allowing him but a scanty sustenance, buries him at last with all the pomp of funeral pageantry.

This kingdom, it seems, was then illumined by *two suns* at the same time. Whilst the old sun was sitting in blaze and glory, the new was rising on the opposite quarter of the heavens, and thus he was getting *above* both heaven and earth, whereas all other suns had, and have since risen *in* the heavens.

This second luminary was Charles Townshend, whose character he delineates as replete, not only with incongruities, but with moral impossibilities, as that of Mr. Grenville. "This portrait," he says, "was drawn because the subject is instructive to those who wish to form themselves on whatever excellence has gone before them; there are many young members in the house who never saw that prodigy Charles Townshend; nor of course know what a ferment he was able to excite in every thing, by the violent ebullition of his mixed virtues and failings." In this manner this benignant orator assumes the office of *youth's parliamentary guide*, describes Mr. Townshend as
yeast

yeast that sets all things in *fermentation*, and recommends him as an *excellence* to be *imitated*.

“ But, adds he, he had no failings which were
 “ not owing to a noble cause, to an ardent, ge-
 “ nerous, perhaps an immoderate passion for fame,
 “ a passion which is the *instinct* of all great souls.”
 Is the love of fame *the instinct*, should it not be
instinctive in all great souls? “ He worshipped that
 “ goddess wheresoever she appeared, but he paid
 “ his particular devotions to her in her favorite
 “ habitations, in her chosen temple, the house of
 “ commons.” This I believe is the first instance of
 that house being considered as the *favourite* habi-
 tation and *chosen temple* of fame. It has been call-
 ed the *temple of corruption*, a *christian chapel* con-
 verted to a *den of thieves*, and distinguished by
 other such appellations. But I believe the orator is
 right in this new denomination. Because it is situated
 exactly as the temple of fame was among the an-
 cients. *Westminster Hall* is the *temple of virtue*
 that leads to it.

He then adds, “ that *besides* the characters of
 “ the individuals that compose their body, it is
 “ impossible not to observe that this house has a
 “ collective character of its own.” This is, in
 plain English, that the members have one cha-
 racter and the house another. “ That character
 “ too, however imperfect, is not unamiable. Like
 “ all great public collections of men, they possess
 “ a marked *love of virtue*, and *abhorrence of vice*.”
 And this being a character *besides*, or *more than* is
 in them as *individuals*, they are, as single men, most
 abominable profligates ; and in the aggregate the
 most meritorious of human beings. And thus by
 a singular phenomenon in moral nature, *each* of
 them clubs his *quota* of what *neither* of them pos-
 sesses.

esses. However, this is rare news for poor old England. We can have nothing now to dread from so virtuous a body. Corruption is dead. *Liberty and property, roast beef and the lord's prayer* are for ever secured.

He now gives you a dissertation on the vice of obstinacy, and exemplifies it in his own oration. To this he adds, "that Mr. Townshend voted for the stamp-act, voted for the repeal of it, and then voted for the tax on tea, &c." And that he followed the example of those speakers in the house, "who had no opinions, no principles, no order nor system in their policy, no sequel or connection in their ideas, as far as it could be discovered by their harangues. That he was a candidate for contradictory honours, and his great aim was to make those agree in admiration of him, who never agreed in any thing else." What this gentleman can mean by contradictory honours I cannot conceive. How can any thing that *contradicts honour* be *honour in itself*, any more than that which *contradicts truth* can be *verity*. However, one of these honours is changing opinion with the times. Imitating the unintelligible in speaking is another. And these are, I suppose, among the particular excellences on which this *youth's guide* would instruct the young members to form themselves.

There is one instance of Mr. Townshend's great excellence, in winning the hearts of the members, which is too conspicuous and instructive to be omitted; as it is probably the only way that one in a hundred is able to win them. "*He hit the house just between wind and water.*" In this instance of metaphoric transcendence, the force of genius can no further go. This image, with
most

most remarkable propriety, and equally inimitable decency is taken from the song of

A tinker and a taylor,
A soldier and a failor ;
Had once a doubtful strife, fir,
To make a maid a wife, fir,
Whose name was buxom Joan, &c.
The failor let fly at her,
And *bit 'twixt wind and water,*
Which *won* the fair maid's heart.

By this superlative figure, five hundred and fifty-seven men are converted into one *buxom Joan*. Mr. Townshend is made her gallant, and represented in the actual exercise of winning her heart by a stroke *'twixt wind and water*. Without the obscene application, the words *'twixt wind and water* to the fair maid, the *heart winning bit* is totally unintelligible. For if the house be supposed to be a ship, and the members her crew, a shot *'twixt wind and water*, being the most dangerous that can be given, can never *win* their hearts.

As this unexampled idea of winning the house, deserves to be eternally preserved, I would willingly hope that the right honorable John Wilkes, Esq; lord mayor of London; and member for the county of Middlesex, will move that, at the public expence, it be exhibited in bronze; a proper metal for him to recommend, and peculiarly adapted for the preservation of so chaste an imagery. May not the fair maid be distinguished by the speakers robes and great wig; the mace under her head; and the journals of the house composing the couch on which the operation is performing, by Mr. Townshend habited in the robes of chancellor of the exchequer? may it not serve also as an archetype for a frontispiece to the

next edition of his lordship's most pious essay on woman? And now I beg leave to ask whether this *winning bit* of Mr. Townshend might not have engaged the orator's fancy, when *he carried his argument irresistibly into the body both of the parliament and ministry*. He then tells you the repeal began to be *in* as bad an odour in the house, as the stamp-act had been in the session before. It did indeed stink most abominably in the nostrils of all men of understanding. But as an *egregious stink* is considered as a *source of the sublime* by this speaker, that could have formed no objection to its merit.* "Mr. Townshend moved for the act which placed the duties on tea, white lead, &c. and it was carried." And no mention is made of the duke of Grafton's being at the head of the treasury. May it not have happened, therefore, from the over scrupulous delicacy of this orator, that he abstained, on this occasion, from mentioning his *grace*; as *he* might conceive that minister had been amply calumniated by *Junius*?

There is one passage which it would be unjust in me to omit, as it proves that this speaker is undeviatingly uniform in the manner of his figurative expressions. "While the house hung in this uncertainty, now the *bear hims* rose from this side, now *they re-bellowed* from the other." And thus the *sounds* which rose on one side were converted into *persons* on the other, and *re-bellowed*. "And that party to whom they fell, at length, from their *tremulous and dancing balance*, always received them in a tempest of applause." I confess I do not well conceive the meaning of this *tremulous and dancing ballance* from which the *bear hims* fell. Unless indeed pretending to be ballance

masters,

* Sublime and beautiful, sect. 21.

masters, and to dance the tremulous tight rope, they fell from thence into one of the parties, and were thus received in a *tempest* of applause.

The orator now returns to "lord Hillsborough and the present ministry; revives his old story; talks of the act, stating that it is expedient to raise a revenue in America; of a partial repeal annihilating the greatest part of that revenue; of a secretary of state disclaiming, in the king's name, all thoughts of such a substitution in future; and says that the principle of the disclaimer goes to what has been left, as well as what has been repealed." A long and tedious *repetition* of what he has already *repeatedly* spoken, all which has been repeatedly refuted. For that reason you shall hear no more of it. And then adds he, "I shall vote for the question which leads to the repeal of both," that is the act which imposed the duties, and that which took off all the others but that on tea. "He now resumes the importance of a dictator, if you do not fall in with this motion, then secure something to fight for, consistent in theory and valuable in practice." Is not the legislative authority of this realm an object consistent in theory and valuable in practice? is not this the object to be fought for, should fighting be necessary to secure it? "if you must employ your strength," says he, "employ it to uphold you in some honorable right, or some profitable wrong." Is not that authority an honorable right for which this strength is employed? and the *present* ministry do not chuse to desert or to support the honorable right, which the parliament constitutionally possesses over the Americans, by following the example of that *profitable wrong*, which was done by repealing the stamp-act.

“Your ministers,” says he, “in their own and his majesty’s name, have already adopted the American distinction of internal and external duties. It is a distinction, whatever merit it may have, that was originally moved by the Americans themselves.” The falsity of this assertion hath been already evinced from governor Bernard’s letters. These positively pronounce that the colonists embraced it from what had been spoken in parliament by the ministers whom this speaker would vindicate, when they formed the opposition to Mr. Grenville : and this circumstance discloses the reason for his transferring it to the Americans. However, adds he, “I think they will acquiesce in it, if they are not pushed with too much *logic*, and too little *sense* in all the consequences.” And thus by a distinction as absurd as that between the right of internal and of external taxation, *logic*, is made to be one thing, and *sense* another. May not this opinion afford some reason for his manner of arguing?

“That is,” says he, “if external taxation be understood, as they and you understand it when you please, to be not a distinction of geography but of policy, that it is a power for regulating trade and not for supporting establishments.” But when did it please the Americans to understand it in that light, until the arguments, urged against the stamp-act, were transmitted to them? It has been already proved from governor Bernard’s letters, that, previous to that time, they understood no difference between external and internal duties. And when did the ministry understand that it is a power for regulating trade, and not for supporting establishments? For indeed who can understand, that taxation, which is the *effect* of power, can be
the

the *power* which creates itself? may they not as well understand how a man may leap over his own shadow.

“ This distinction,” says he, “ which is nothing with regard to right, is of most weighty consideration in practice.” Why then, when the stamp-act was repealed, did not that minister preserve the exertion of the sovereign authority, in that manner of external taxation, by an act of that kind? “ recover your old ground, and your old tranquility,” says he, “ try it; I am persuaded the Americans will compromise with you.” Shall the ministry, to whom the executive power is committed, compromise with rebels, respecting that allegiance by which they are bound to obey the laws: or the parliament enter into compromise with such subjects respecting their indubitable right to sovereign legislature? “ consult and follow your experience,” he adds, “ let not the long story, with which I have exercised your patience, prove fruitless to your interests.” Experience has been followed. That experience which is derived from the dastardly flight before rebellion, and from the repealing of the stamp-act. His long story can have no other reasonable effect than to refute all that he would confirm; to justify all that he has reprehended; and to turn the stomachs of all who heard or read him.

He now turns field preacher, and says, “ all this is in the hand of providence.” And then, notwithstanding he allows it to be in such unexceptionable hands, he would persuade the commons to prefer *his* opinion even to a trust in *God*. For “ now, even now,” says he, “ I should confide in the prevailing virtue and efficacious operation of lenity, though working in darkness and in chaos. In the midst of all this unnatural and

“ turbid combination, I should hope it might produce order and beauty in the end.” But as providence produced, the order and beauty of this world, out of darkness and chaos, may it not be as safe to confide in *that* as in the *advice* of Edmund Burke, Esq?

“ Let us embrace,” says he, “ some system or other before we end this session. Do you mean to tax America, and to draw a *productive* revenue from thence?” what kind of revenue is that which *produces nothing at all*? “if you do, speak out: name, fix, ascertain this revenue; settle its quantity; define its objects; provide for its collection; and then fight when you have something to fight for.” By the permission of this politician, the ministry are advancing in a more equitable and manly manner. They will first establish the legislative authority to tax; restore, to activity, that power which the minister, under whom he served, so fatally benumbed; and then fix the revenue and what relates to it. But it seems the sovereign rights of the realm are nothing to fight for.

He continues, “ if you do murder—rob—if you kill, take possession, and do not appear in the character of madmen as well as assassins, violent, vindictive, bloody and tyrannical without an object.” Has not every precaution been taken, and every lenient measure carried into execution to prevent bloodshed and deprivation of property? in what æra, in what nation, by what sovereign have such manifestations of lenity, and slowness to wrath been given? and if at length the sword alone must subdue the rebellious and fanatic revolt of these Americans, will it be *murder* to slay the *rebel*; or *robbery* to take his *possessions*? can a
sovereign,

sovereign, his parliament, and ministers on such conduct be deemed to be *violent, vindictive, bloody,* and *tyrannical assassins*? no—the blood of those who may be slain will be on the heads of that ministry who, apostates from their country's cause, inflamed them to rebellion. And this speaker may rest assured, that better councils will guide them, than *he* has given, or can give. “Leave America to tax herself, leave the Americans as they anciently stood, and these distinctions, born of our unhappy contest, will die along with it. They and we, and their and our ancestors have been happy under that system. Let the memory of all actions, in contradiction to that good old mode, on both sides be extinguished for ever.” Such is the insidious voice of the hyena, which imitating the plaintive wailings of a child, ensnares the traveller to listen and be devoured. The true meaning of it is, follow the steps of me and my minister, and restore us to some degree of credit by proving, that you, the present ministers, are incapable of being admonished by the misdeeds which we have committed.

If you, my fellow-subjects, still preserve your reason, thus it must appear. If you are susceptible of sensation, you will feel this insult on your understandings. If you value your rights, happiness, and claim to equal freedom, you will resent this insidiousness to deprive you of them. If you are men, you will support your king, his parliament, his ministers, and your country's dignity. Abhor and renounce, therefore, all those who have so long seduced you to become the abettors of rebellion!

He then adds, "be content to bind America
 " by laws of trade, you have always done it ;
 " let this be your reason for binding their trade."
 But will you bind yourselves to be their slaves,
 and to work for their ease and opulence ? The very
 tax he labours to repeal, is a tax on trade: The like
 has been repeatedly imposed from their first charter,
 in the reign of King William, to this hour, as he
 has acknowledged, "do not burthen them by
 " taxes, you were not used to do so from the be-
 " ginning. These are the arguments of states and
 " kingdoms." What state or kingdom did ever
 argue in that way, and practise in consequence
 thereof ? Because, in the infant state of a colony,
 when the constituents were few, embarrassed with
 the difficulties of a new settlement in providing
 food, raiment, and shelter from the weather, they
 were left untaxed. Because they were so permit-
 ted to remain, during the encouragement which
 was given, by this their mother country, in their
 rapid progress to happiness and wealth. Are they
 after millions have been spent, thousands and ten
 thousands of your fellow subjects slaughtered, to
 procure and establish them in security, still to
 be left untaxed ? do *states* and *kingdoms* argue that
 because their colonies paid *nothing* in tax, when
 they had *nothing* to pay it with, that therefore
 when they *overflow with a redundance of riches*,
 they still ought to continue untaxed by that
 very sovereign authority which cherished, en-
 couraged, and sustained them during all their
 difficulties and wars ? That authority which
 they never disallowed ; to which they con-
 stantly applied for assistance ; and from whence
 they as constantly received it ? What *kingdom*,
 what

what *state*, hath ever *argued* in that preposterous manner? or what orator, but this, hath ever conceived them capable of offering arguments so repugnant to every idea of common sense? Yet such is the opinion of this celebrated speaker, who in every paragraph, even in his affected humilities, evinces that he presumes himself sufficient to the guidance of a kingdom. Hence arise his peremptory advice, his virulent reprehension, and his illiberal confidence in delivering his sentiments.

“ But,” says he, “ if intemperately, unwisely, “ fatally, you sophisticate and poison the very “ source of government, by urging subtle deductions, and consequences odious to those you “ govern, from the unlimited and illimitable nature of supreme sovereignty, you will *teach* them “ by these means to call that sovereignty itself in “ question.” This is indeed a singular and a pleasant supposition. Deductions are made a *new* kind of *poison*; and then these *deductions* are drawn from the nature of *supreme sovereignty*, to *poison* the *source* of government, which is drawing *poison* from a *thing* to *poison* itself. But that the Americans should now *be to be taught* to call that sovereignty in question, after they have been so long instructed by this gentleman and his associates, and are in actual rebellion against it, is really a singular supposition. And now he acknowledges this very sovereignty to be *unlimited* and *illimitable*. The contrary of which he has represented in both respects, with regard to America.

“ If that sovereignty and their freedom,” says he, “ can not be reconciled, which will they take? “ They will cast your sovereignty in your face.” But on what does he found this *if*? It is on this very

very sovereignty, and this exertion of it, the right to be taxed by parliament alone, that we in Britain found our *freedom*. How comes it to pass, that what constitutes the liberty of Britons, can be irreconcilable with that of America? And as to their casting it in our face, that they have done already. "No body will be argued into slavery," says he. But every subject ought to be compelled to his allegiance. "Let the gentlemen on the other side call forth all their ability; let the best of them get up and tell me, what one character of liberty the Americans have, and what one brand of slavery they are free from, if they are bound in their property and industry by all the restraints you can imagine, on commerce, and industry; by all the restraints you can imagine at the same time are made pack-horses of every tax you choose to impose, without the least share in granting them."

In this page is there not a small mistake of *slavery* for *petty larceny*, in the term *brand*? Nevertheless, I will allow him, "if the Americans be so bound by all imaginable restraints on commerce, and made pack-horses to carry every tax that may be imposed on them," that they will be slaves indeed. But is a tax of *three-pence* a pound on tea, a restraint on commerce that binds their industry and property; when, by that tax, they are eased of four times that sum, which they paid before? and are they made pack-horses of every tax by carrying that *one*? As to their being without the least share in granting them, in that instance they stand exactly as five millions and half out of six millions of this kingdom indisputably stand.

He then adds: "When they bear the burthens of unlimited monopoly, will you bring them to
" bear

“ bear the burthens of unlimited revenue too ?” I have fully disproved the unlimited monopoly already ; and if their revenues be no more oppressive than *that*, they will be the freest people under heaven. “ The Englishman in America will “ feel this is slavery.——That it is *legal* slavery, “ will be no compensation either to his feelings “ or his understandings.” What an *Englishman*, *born in America*, may feel, I can not tell. But if he do not feel slavery but from unlimited monopoly and unlimited revenue, he and his progeny will be free for ever.

He then says, “ Lord Carmarthen, who spoke “ some time ago, is full of the fire of ingenuous “ youth ; and when he has modelled the ideas of “ a lively imagination, by farther experience, “ he will be an ornament to his country in either “ house.” I have some doubts whether the ideas of this nobleman’s imagination may want modelling. My reason is, that this orator, in all his arguments, narrative, similes, metaphors, hyperboles, and tropes has shewn, to demonstration, that he is incapable of modelling ideas. But if his lordship should be in that want, I need not intreat him *not* to place Mr. Burke for his *model*. For if he should, is it not evident, that he can never become an ornament to his country either in or out of the houses ?

“ This lord, however, says, that the Americans “ are our children, and how can they revolt against “ their parent ? he says, if they are not free in “ their present state, England is not free ; Because Manchester, and other considerable places, “ are not represented. So then, because some “ towns in England are not represented, America “ is to have no representatives at all ?” But I shall

shall presume to prove, that the Americans are as much *represented* as the people of Great Britain, and are in possession of every right, respecting the election of members to serve in parliament, that Britons enjoy. It is universally allowed, that not more than a tenth part of this people have an elective right in the returning of members to parliament; and it is equally certain, that these members, being returned, are instantly become the representatives of *all* the subjects, though elected by the *few*; that they are as equally obliged to protect the welfare, and promote the interests of the former as the latter. An application to the representatives in parliament, is as much the right of the non-electors, and as uniformly attended to as that of the others. The Americans have always enjoyed, equally with yourselves, this common right of being represented. And in consequence thereof, they have applied to parliament, and received the aids of money, fleets, and armies. How then are they unrepresented more than all others who have no elective right? But it has been said, that all Britons may legally become electors; they are not excluded from that privilege as the Americans are. This assertion is founded on a like basis of untruth with the former. Every American possesses this privilege, equally with every Englishman. If he enjoy an hereditary freehold of forty shillings a year in England, or if he purchase it, he votes as either of you in the like situation. If either by the right of servitude, purchase, or presentation, he be free of the livery of London; or a freeman of any city or town corporate, where freedom gives a vote, he there enjoys the right of election equally with

with you. Let him purchase a burgage tenure, or pay scot and lot, he votes from those rights: and every mode of obtaining that privilege, in all places and respects, is equally open to him as to you. In consequence of these rights, we have seen Trecothick lord mayor of London, Sayre and Lee sheriffs, all born in America. In the last parliament Trecothick and Huske were members, Cruger in this, all Americans born; besides a multitude of others whom the sugar islands have furnished for that purpose. Thus it seems, with every right of Englishmen, they still complain that they are precluded. And whilst this orator, and others of a like stamp, are *exclaiming* against taxing these Americans, because they are not represented, they prove by those *very exclamations* that they are. For what does representation include more than parliamentary proceedings in this manner? And what seems not a little singular, those American-born members, whilst they deny the parliamentary right of taxing *themselves* in America, do without hesitation presume to tax *you* in Britain.

There is yet another plea which is urged in their favour: that they are taxed without their own consent; and may therefore be taxed to any excess the parliament shall please. By whose consent are you taxed in England? Is it by that of the electors? No. For they are never consulted on the imposition of any tax. Is the delegation of that authority to raise money, given by the few who choose, to those that are chosen, adequate to the whole community's being taxed by their own consent? Since five millions and half, of the six in Britain, are not concerned in that consent of choice, can the Americans justly complain of not
pos-

possessing that choice, who are in the same predicament?

As an objection, to the right of parliamentary taxation, it is urged, that the Americans may be taxed when the Britons are not. Have not you been taxed *without* them, from their origin to this day; more particularly during the last war, to such an enormous degree, that you were mortgaged for seventy millions of money to defend their properties; whilst they were raising what sums *they pleased only*, and for their own protection in America alone? But if that mode, of being taxed *without* you, be grievous; let all future taxes be extended through the colonies, and that complaint must cease. Appeal to this speaker's description of their happiness and wealth, you will find they can afford it equally with you.

Such being the true state of the Americans, of what does this arbitrary oppression consist, against which the virulence of licentious obloquy is so egregiously let loose? Where is the illegality; where the injustice in the exertion of the sovereign authority to lay duties on the Colonists? But "they are *our children*; and when children ask for *bread*, "are we to give a stone?" When was this *asking of bread* returned by giving them a *stone*? Have they asked for representatives? — Have they not declared in the congress, they will have none? Is the *stone* applicable in this instance? But when children are refractory; renounce their duty; and even oppose their parent with force, are they not to be chastised and brought back to obedience?

"When this child of ours, says he, wishes to assimilate to its parent and to reflect, with a true filial resemblance, the beauteous countenance of British

"rish liberty ; are we to turn to them the *shame-*
 "ful parts of our constitution ? are we to give
 "them our weakness for their strength ; our op-
 "probrium for their glory, and the slough of
 "slavery, which we are not able to work off, to
 "serve them for their freedom ?" But when will
 this child wish to become assimilated into one sub-
 stance with its parent ? Are disobedience to the
 laws ; a congress, subverting not only the con-
 stitution of the colonies, but of Great Bri-
 tain also ; which acts with legislative power ;
 annuls the statutes of this kingdom, and
 erects itself into the establishing of what they
 please ; Are the seizing of the public money,
 and taking arms against this parent, the tokens of
 wishing to assimilate ? Is this the mode "of re-
 flecting, with a true filial resemblance, the beaute-
 ous countenance of British liberty ?" To turn to
 them our *backsides*, when they shall return to their
 duty, will be as culpable as were this orator and
 associates, when they turned those *shameful* parts
 to them ; and fled to repeal the stamp-act, &c.
 But it seems this *beauteous* countenance of *true*
 British liberty, is composed of *weakness*, *oppro-*
brium, and *slavery*, the *slough* of which we are
 unable to work off ? How *beautiful* is this coun-
 tenance ! how *true* this liberty ! And yet, all the
weakness, *disgrace*, and *slavery* of this constitution,
 are to be imparted by an *exertion* of that *right*,
 which we in England estimate as our *strength*, *dig-*
nity, and *freedom* ; that of being *taxed* by the *par-*
liament alone.

" If this be the case," says he, " ask yourselves
 " this question, will they be content in such a
 " state of slavery ?" Such slavery as he himself
 has

has denominated *true British liberty*. The very state in which you stand. Can you be *free* and *they* be *slaves*, under the same legislative power, and popular rights? let the Orator reconcile this contradiction if he can? let him, in justice to truth, and to you, sing his *palinodia*, recant his oration, and prove that, by confessing his mistakes, he intended no mischief to this country? or, let the criminality of his speech rest upon him. You will be no more deluded by *sounds* to oppose the *ideas* of truth; and to acquiesce in the subjection, of this kingdom and of your own rights, to the rebels of America.

“If not, look to the consequences,” says he, look to’t, for thunder will do’t. “Reflect how you are to govern a people who think they ought to be free, and think they are not.” The parliament and the ministry are now engaged in looking to the true means of recovering a people from the delirium of thinking they are *not free* in the midst of *freedom*.

“And such is the state of America,” he adds, “that after wading up to your eyes in blood, you could only end where you began, that is, to tax, where no revenue is to be found.” Is there no revenue to be found in countries overflowing with commerce, in the midst of ease and plenty, as he has described them? where then are they to be sought for? but as by all the preceding parts of this speech you are convinced of the futility of his judgment on things *past*; would it not be an egregious absurdity to listen to his *prediction* of things to come? “Lo,---my voice fails me,” says he, “my inclination, indeed, carries me no farther. All is confusion beyond it.” And *before*
it

it too. Hartshorn! hartshorn! for the Orator! he faints
---he revives---heaven be praised---he speaks again.

“ Well, I have recovered a little, and before I
“ sit down, I must say something to another point,
“ with which gentlemen urge us.” Out with it
then. “ What is to become of the declaratory
“ act, asserting the *entireness* of the British legis-
“ lative authority, if we abandon the practice of
“ taxation?” This is a question which, I think,
a wise man would never have proposed, unless it
be wisdom to set a trap to catch himself?

“ For my part,” says he, “ I look upon the
“ rights stated in that act, exactly in the manner
“ in which I viewed them on its very first propo-
“ sition, and which I have often taken the liberty,
“ with *great humility*, to lay before you.” His
humility is great, indeed. “ I look upon the im-
“ perial rights of Great Britain, and the privi-
“ leges which the colonies ought to enjoy under
“ these rights, to be just the most reconcileable
“ things in the world. The parliament of Great
“ Britain sits at the head of her extensive empire
“ in *two* capacities; one as the local legislature
“ of this island, providing for all things at home,
“ and by no other instrument than the executive
“ power. The other, and I think, her nobler ca-
“ pacity, is, what I call her imperial character;
“ in which, as from the throne of heaven, she su-
“ perintends all the inferior legislatures and guides,
“ and controuls them all without annihilating any.”

Thus the *entireness* of the British legislative au-
thority, consists of *two distinct parts*, and are just the
most reconcileable things in the world. This, however,
is the capacity in which she *sits*, as well *respect-*
ing England as the colonies. She superintends,
guides, and controuls all the several inferior legis-

latures, which have been granted to the corporations of this realm, by patents from the crown; in which predicament exactly and alone the colonies do really stand. And therefore, as this speaker declares, "all these provincial legislatures ought to be subordinate to the parliament, else they can neither preserve mutual peace, nor hope for mutual justice; nor effectually afford mutual assistance. It is necessary to coerce the negligent, to restrain the violent, and to aid the weak and deficient by the over-ruling plenitude of her power." The executive power, which had been annihilated by abrogating the stamp act, and the legislative which had been virtually abolished by the declaratory, were both of them called into action by the statute which laid the duty on tea. It is, therefore, indisputably right, according to this opponent, that this legislative authority should be established; because it is essential to the constitution. It is necessary that it should be supported by every means of government; because the Americans deny that right, and are in rebellion against it. The orator, therefore, hath absolutely refuted all that he has urged before. He hath confirmed the rectitude of that measure, which he has so vehemently decryed. He hath shewn the necessity of that law which he has laboured to repeal. He hath justified all that the ministry have done, and are doing. And he hath exposed his own imbecility, or perfidiousness of opposition, by ultimately coinciding with their measures.

"However, says he, the British parliament is never to intrude into the place of the others, whilst they are equal to the common ends of their institution." It never did. It does not at present. The *common end* of their institution

is to provide for their provincial expences, as is that of the corporate bodies of England. But the *universal* end is that of contributing, in due proportions, to the support of the British empire; and this no corporation by patent can do. And, then, in contradiction to all that he has been labouring to effect, he says, "in order to enable parliament to answer all these provident and beneficent superintendence, her power must be boundless." Thus he proceeds even to defeat what his own party have advanced. And to shew the inefficacy of requisition to the colonies he adds, "the gentlemen, says he, who think the powers of parliament limited, may please themselves to talk of requisitions. But suppose these requisitions are not obeyed? what? shall there be no reserved power in the empire to supply a deficiency which may weaken, divide, and dissipate the whole? we are engaged in a war; the secretary of state calls upon the colonies to contribute; some would do it; I think most would cheerfully furnish whatever is demanded. One or two, suppose, hang back, and easing themselves, let the stress of the draft lie on the others, surely it is proper that some authority might legally say, *Tax yourselves for the common supply, or parliament will do it for you.*"

But he and the advocates for requisition should know that no servant of the king can legally apply for national supplies, to the colonies. It would be an extent of the prerogative equally criminal with raising money by proclamation. It would be destroying the most essential liberty of Magna Charta, and other innumerable laws; it would be laying taxes without consent of parliament. Nor would the mischief end there. Such a requisition for sup-

plies would at once impart a legislative right to the Americans of raising and refusing aids, if parliament should acquiesce in that application. For the very essence of a requisition supposes a right inherent in those to whom it is made, of granting or refusing what may be asked. Otherwise it is an arbitrary demand. If they refuse, says the orator, then the parliament is to compel them. Thus you are first to give them the liberty both of granting and refusing; and then *compel* them to *grant* if they *dare* to exert their *right* to refuse. This is the liberty which he is contending to establish in America. This would, indeed, be *slavery* embittered by the consideration of a *liberty* granted on purpose to be subverted.

He then adds, "this ought to be no ordinary power, nor ever used in the first instance." The power of parliament is no ordinary power. And it *cannot* be used but in the *first* instance; as is evidently manifest. "This, says he, is what I meant when I have said, at various times, that I consider the power of taxing in parliament as an instrument of empire, and not as a means of supply." This is a distinction so refined, that it is either totally unintelligible; or so ridiculous, that it cannot be sufficiently derided. "The *power* of *taxing* in parliament is *not* a *means* of *raising* a *supply*, but an *instrument* of empire." And to what can empire apply that *instrument* but to raise a *supply*? Thus according to him, that, which the *instrument* can *only* do is *not* its business. And an axe for hewing wood is for the same reason not an instrument of cutting, altho' it be applicable to no other purpose. And now he tells you, "such is his idea of the constitution of the British empire, as distinguished from the constitution of Britain." And thus

thus this realm hath *two* constitutions. The second needless, and never till now conceived; or *one distinguished from itself*; which *distinction* is to the full as ingenious as the *exception of America to itself*.

However, he gives you his opinion, "that on these grounds subordination and liberty may be sufficiently reconciled through the whole; whether to satisfy a refining speculatist, or a factious Demagogue, he knows not, but enough, surely, for the ease and happiness of man." That is, by the prudent addition of turning that *liberty*, which the Americans *now* enjoy in common with all other Britons, of being taxed by the legislative authority, into a state of being *compelled* to pay what they would then have a *right to refuse*. Such are his ideas of liberty and legislature. And now to your judgment I appeal, "whether he has shewn to Mr. Cornwall, that you are to lose nothing by complying with the motion, to repeal the tea act, except what you have lost already." When by that compliance you must flee from the face of rebels who dispute the sovereign authority. Hath "he shewn that in time of peace you flourished in commerce?" What prevents it at present but the rebellion which hath been excited by the harangues of faction in parliament? "you had sufficient aid from the colonies, while you pursued your antient policy." Whence then did it arrive that you spent so many millions in their defence even in America? "were all things thrown, into confusion by the stamp act?" when that confusion arose from decrying in parliament the right to tax America internally: and that it was not only kept alive but encouraged, "when it was repealed, is irrefragable?" "what bad effects has the revival of the system of taxation produced?"

duced? what universal evil has the partial repeal effected? but such as evidently flow from that fountain which had been polluted by the opposition in parliament; and which, according to the opinion of this very man, ought to have been undertaken to support that legislative authority which Britain does possess, and which he and his associates had virtually demolished? And now, let *these* considerations, founded on facts, not one of which *he* can disprove, confirm you in that reason which is supported by experience. Can the long and tedious harangue which hath been so amply proved in every shape, so nugatory and inept, be possibly received as a confutation of Mr. Cornwall? every paragraph which it contains pronounces the contrary.

But “on this business of America, he confesses
 “he is serious even to sadness. He has had but one
 “opinion concerning it since and before he sat in
 “parliament.” In this very speech has he not
 proved himself to have been of *two*? he has asserted,
 “that the very image of liberty would be lost in
 America, if the colonies *were taxed by parliament* ;”
 and he has said, “that *such taxation is absolutely ne-
 cessary*.” But mark his modesty, “lord North
 “will, as usual, probably attribute the part taken
 “by *him* and his friends, in this business, to a
 “desire of getting his places. Let him enjoy
 “that happy and original idea. If *I* deprived
 “him of it, says he, I should take away most of
 “his wit and all his argument.” Oh! what an exuberance of vanity is here displayed! Edmund Burke, from the place of clerk to lord Rockingham, looks up to the posts of First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer! I will not recur to the fall of Phaeton, in order to admonish
 this

this *orator* of his rash ambition ; because *Phaeton* was the *son* of *Apollo*. Let him remember only, that pride and ambition were the downfall of Old Cole's dog. He *would* take the wall of a waggon, and was crushed to death. It must be confessed, indeed, that this celebrated speaker does stand most egregiously in need of *those two places* ; not only for the *wit* and *argument* which they include, but for a multiplicity of other reasons to the full as *cogent*.

I do verily believe that neither lord North, nor any man did ever conceive the slightest notion, that Edmund Burke presumed to be a candidate for the post of prime minister. It is an *original* idea, which no man hath at any time enjoyed, except that orator himself. But do you not tremble for the danger in which his lordship now stands ? Was it not with a view of succeeding to his places, that Edmund Burke, with such amazing propriety, threatened to impeach his lordship this session of parliament ? with what sufficiency he can fill those high offices, every paragraph of his speech, every action in which he conducted *his own* prime minister, loudly declares. But such, it seems, is his opinion of his lordship's iniquities, " he had rather bear
 " the brunt of all his wit, and blows much heavier, than stand answerable to God for embracing
 " a system that tends to the destruction of some
 " of the very best and fairest of his works." Does he mean the constitution of this realm ? That I have shewn to demonstration, he hath laboured to destroy ; and which lord North is now engaged in reinstating. Does he mean the liberty of the Americans ? That also it is evident he would oppress, by his requisition and his parliamentary right upon that again. In these circumstances he

stands, and for these sins he must answer to his God.

"But," says he, "I know the map of England as well as the noble lord, or any other person; and I know that the way I take, is not the road to preferment." The road to preferment is the *king's road*; and I suspect that *he* is not indulged with a *key* to it; and let me add, for other reasons than his *speech making*. However, "Mr. Dowdeswell, his excellent and honourable friend, has trod that road, with great toil, upwards of twenty years together. He is not yet arrived to the noble lord's destination: however, his tracks," says he, "are those I ever wished to follow; because I knew they ever lead to honour." And to profit too, or else a man might wear out his old brogues without getting money to buy a new pair. Hence it is evident, that this orator is wishing to follow the tracks which lead to the honourable post of chancellor of the Exchequer. It is a modest ambition, may he be rewarded according to his merits.

At last he reverts to this declaration: "By *limiting* the exercise of parliamentary power, it fixes on the firmest foundation a real, consistent, well-grounded authority in parliament." And thus, with contradictions to himself, he concludes as he began, and has proceeded. He hath already asserted, that this parliamentary *power* is *illimitable*, and that it *must* be *boundless*." Thus *impossibilities* must be effected. That which is *illimitable* must be *limited*, "in order to fix a real, consistent, and well-grounded authority in parliament."

Such is the celebrated harangue of this popular speaker. He hath listened to the enticements of
vanity;

vanity his Dalilah ; he hath disclosed, by the publication of this speech, that his force consists in words alone. He hath slept in her lap. She hath rescinded his strength. You may bind him with a cob-web. And now let me invite you to reflect on what has been offered to your consideration. Are you not convinced, that an insufficiency of science attends on all he offers ; whether it be in polity, legislature, human-kind, history, commerce, or finance ? Is not his talent of reasoning devoid of all true and genuine logic ? Does it fully amount to sophistry ; has it even the merit of that *salacious* argument ? instead of imagination it is animal vivacity active to unite incongruous and impossible images in the same object ; by which aspiring to *soar*, he *precipitates* his *descent* into the fathomless *profund*. If you consider him on the side of declamation, are his endeavours attended with more success ? void of sensibility in himself, his words are unimpassioned and uncreative of emotion in the bosoms of his hearers. He would excite aversion from the ministry ; his language carries no satire, nor calls up the least resentment. He would awake compassion for the Americans, but every syllable is inexpressive of sympathetic tenderness ; it touches no heart. But in malignity without wit, in derision without humour, and in vanity without caute or bounds, he is truly great. Review him in the art of rhetoric ! what is his exordium but a flounce into false metaphor ? his *confirmation* oversets the *object* he would *sustain*. And in attempting a refutation of Mr. Cornwall, he perfectly refutes himself ? His narrative, in which the simple, undorned, progressive line of facts should be undeviatingly observed, he stuffs with false metaphor ; and deviates into a delineation of characters, which evinces, that he is totally uninstructed in the heart

heart and head of man; and then his évanescent peroration ends in a languid proposal of what is impossible to be done; and which, were it practicable, would be ruinous to the very purpose that he affects to obtain.

Through his whole speech, you have constantly before your mind the arrogance, the self-sufficient vanity of assuming the merit of all things to himself; together with that insolent contempt for other mens abilities, which disgrace even the orations of Cicerò; but not one ray appears of that genius which illumines all his speeches, and so amply compensates for his disgusting self-adulation. — Hath he not all the trash of orator Henley, without the pleasantry which sometimes attended his preachments? In fact, is not his whole harangue a mere play-house storm, that fulminates in sounds, like thunder rumbling from the mustard bowl, but darts no bolt; that flashes in false metaphor, like resin through a candle, but emits no spark of heavenly fire?

Believe me, he will print no more speeches. It is not improbable, however, that he may still be babbling like a young hound, on the scent of every animal, from the field-mouse that creeps among the grass, to the stag that ranges in the forest; and he will be regarded by the Commons, as the babbler is by the pack, to whose openings experience has taught them to pay no attention. But if he listen to the admonitions of unbiassed judgment, he will henceforth remain repentant in one eternal silence in parliament.

Such being the true representation of this speaker's merit; the objects which he and his abettors present to your eyes; and the ends which they would obtain, will you longer be deluded to
give

give countenance to schemes so dishonourable to your country, and so ruinous to yourselves? Your sovereign and his ministry have no design but to alleviate your taxes and encrease your happiness. On that subject, and for your sakes, permit me to indulge the desire of placing things in their true light.

That in all states there must exist a sovereign and uncontrollable power *to do right*, no man hath hitherto disputed. It is congenial with the sensations of humanity. It is inseparable from every just idea of national community; and in this kingdom, the authority of *doing wrong* was originally rescinded, by the form of the constitution. For as you the people, by your representatives, constitute a third estate in the legislature, it is a contradiction to common sense, to conceive that you can have delegated to *them* the right of enacting what shall be injurious to *yourselves*. The full power of doing what is most beneficial to you, is that alone which your sovereign and his servants either desire or would carry into execution. The power of instituting laws, without that of causing them to be obeyed, is an absurdity too egregious to be supported. If the legislative authority be exercised with justice, in making laws; the executive must be alike strenuous in their support, or to what purpose are they made? Otherwise it would be a mockery of government. The principal object of all sovereignty should consist in extending the same laws with equal impartiality over all the subjects of the state. The next, that all these subjects should contribute, both in person and by pecuniary aids, proportionably to their natural and adventitious abilities; because a relaxation to *some* is consequently an oppression of *others*, which is *slavery* in some degree. Such then are the indisputable

disputable rights and duties of government ; and such as you have a right to expect from your legislature and your sovereign. By these I will examine the conduct of his majesty and his present ministry, towards you and the Americans.

When the stamp act was repealed, it appeared to men of sound thinking, that unless the sovereign authority of this realm were actually carried into the colonies, the means of alleviating your oppressions, by obliging them to contribute to the national supplies, would be entirely lost. On that account the act for imposing a tax on tea, &c. in America, was made. It was surely the duty of your representatives to lessen your burthen, by extending it on the shoulders of all your fellow subjects. It was national equity, that pecuniary aids should be supplied by all those who were as adequate to that supply as yourselves, and who were not in a state of general taxation. This prospect of bringing you relief, your sovereign saw with pleasure. A sovereign, who by devoting his conquests, both in the East and West-Indies, to the service of the state, hath proved by facts, his affection for his people. His ministers have carried these gracious intentions into execution. But the Americans, instigated by insidious men, were thankful for the innumerable assistances which they had received from you, in millions spent, and thousands slaughtered. After a war which hath so enormously encreased their commerce with the ceded Islands, and established their security from their former enemies, the Canadians ; Possessed of every right to the enjoyment of honours and advantage which you possess, they determined to revolt from their allegiance ; refused obedience to the sovereign authority ; rejected the law which
was

was then made ; set up a new government ; persevered in rebellion, and left *you* immersed in debts contracted for *their* salvation. Appeal to your own hearts, and if they are not divested of those honourable sensations which for ages have so signally distinguished the race of Britons, will they not applaud the legislature which imposed those duties ; and bless and assist that sovereign and his ministers, who by acts of unexampled mercy and forbearance, are now reducing those rebels to their duty ? It is *your* cause they now are vindicating ! It is *your* ease they are now procuring ! It is the cause of all posterity in which they are now engaged ! These, and the dignity of the British empire, are the incentives to their conduct, and the establishment of them is the end they would obtain. Such being the true designs of your king, his parliament, and his ministers, can those who would oppose such measures, be the friends of Britons ? By the incantation of the sound of liberty for the Americans, they would fascinate your intellects to assist them in their struggles for power, and then deceive you !

At the accession of his majesty to the throne of these realms, of every twenty minutes, hours, days, and years, you laboured, twelve of that toil were wasted, in acquiring that money, which is paid in consequence of taxes, on all the necessities of life. In this wretched condition of oppressive servitude, these abettors of American rebellion labour to hold you still enthralled. Whilst your sovereign, the majority of your representatives, and the ministers, are exerting every nerve to free you from the chains with which you were bound in former reigns. Can *those* who would thus relentlessly bind you to eternal toil, be the friends of *your* liberty ?

Ec.

Believe not me! listen to the Americans themselves, who from the congress at Philadelphia, in their address to you, have said: “ *Know that in less than half a century, the quit-rents reserved to the crown, from the numberless grants of this vast continent, will pour large streams of wealth into the royal coffers; and if to this be added the power of taxing America at pleasure, the crown will be rendered independent on you for supplies, and will possess more treasure than may be necessary to purchase the remains of liberty in your island.*”

Oh, that the propitious day were come, that could enable his majesty to alleviate your taxes! with what joy would it be accomplished! would that sovereign, who has devoted his conquests to the welfare of his people, withhold his revenues from lessening their oppressions? Yet such is the flagitious insult, of these rebels, on your understandings, that under the terrifying idea of the remains of liberty being to be purchased from you, they would delude you to unite with them; and not only withdraw *themselves* from contributing to the national supplies, but prevent that royal revenue from being transmitted into England, for the alleviating of *your* burthens. That revenue which alone can annually diminish your taxes; gradually restore to you every moment of your labour; and apply every shilling which you earn, to the purchasing of *things without taxation*. If you be men, you will manifest your abhorrence of *their* ingratitude and treason; and oppose with contempt and detestation *all their abettors*, who would delude you, to sustain their interests, at the certainty of precluding all means of establishing your felicity.

F I N I S.